Synopsis Purioris Theologiae
Synopsis of a Purer Theology

Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions

Edited by

Andrew Colin Gow (*Edmonton, Alberta*)

In cooperation with

Sylvia Brown (*Edmonton, Alberta*) – Falk Eisermann (*Berlin*)
Berndt Hamm (*Erlangen*) – Johannes Heil (*Heidelberg*) – Susan C.
Karant-Nunn (*Tucson, Arizona*) – Martin Kaufhold (*Augsburg*)
Erik Kwakkel (*Leiden*) – Jürgen Miethke (*Heidelberg*)
Christopher Ocker (*San Anselmo and Berkeley, California*)

Founding Editor

Heiko A. Oberman †

VOLUME 204

Texts & Sources

Edited by

Falk Eisermann (*Berlin*)

VOLUME 8

The titles published in this series are listed at *brill.com/smrtts*

Synopsis Purioris Theologiae
Synopsis of a Purer Theology

Latin Text and English Translation

VOLUME 2
DISPUTATIONS 24–42

Volume Editor
Henk van den Belt

Translator
Riemer A. Faber

General Editors
Andreas J. Beck
William den Boer
Riemer A. Faber

Subseries Editor
Falk Eisermann

BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Cover illustration: Title page of the pamphlet for disputation 31, Andreas Rivetus, *Disputationum theologicarum trigesima-prima, de fide et perseverantia sanctorum*, resp. Paulus Testardus (Leiden: Isaac Elzevir, 1622), courtesy of the University of Michigan library (Special Collections). Image used with permission. Further reproduction is prohibited without permission from the University of Michigan Library.

The Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is available online at http://catalog.loc.gov
LC record available at http://lccn.loc.gov/2016033200

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: "Brill". See and download: brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 1573-4188
ISBN 978-90-04-32421-3 (hardback)
ISBN 978-90-04-32867-9 (e-book)

Copyright 2016 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Hes & De Graaf, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Rodopi and Hotei Publishing.
All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.
Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

Contents

Notes on Contributors VII
Acknowledgements XI
List of Abbreviations XIII

Introduction 1

Text and Translation

Disputation 24. On Divine Predestination 22

Disputation 25. On the Incarnation of the Son of God and the Personal Union of the Two Natures in Christ 66

Disputation 26. On the Office of Christ 100

Disputation 27. On Christ in his State of Humiliation 130

Disputation 28. On Jesus Christ in his State of Exaltation 158

Disputation 29. On the Satisfaction by Jesus Christ 180

Disputation 30. On the Calling of People to Salvation 208

Disputation 31. On Faith and the Perseverance of the Saints 228

Disputation 32. On Repentance 276

Disputation 33. On the Justification of Man in the Sight of God 304

Disputation 34. On Good Works 342

Disputation 35. On Christian Freedom 372

Disputation 36. On the Religious Practice of Invocation 412

Disputation 37. On Almsgiving and Fasting 442

Disputation 38. On Vows 482

Disputation 39. On Purgatory and Indulgences 498

Disputation 40. On the Church 558

Disputation 41. On Christ as Head of the Church, and on the Antichrist 588

Disputation 42. On the Calling of those who Minister to the Church, and on Their Duties 620

Glossary of Concepts and Terms 661
Bibliography 674
Scripture Index 692
General Index 711

Notes on Contributors

A.J. (*Andreas*) *Beck*
(1965), Ph.D. (2007) Utrecht University, is Professor of Historical Theology and Academic Dean at the Evangelische Theologische Faculteit, Leuven, and the director of the Institute of Post-Reformation Studies there. He is the author of *Gisbertus Voetius* (*1589–1676*)*: Sein Theologieverständnis und seine Gotteslehre* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), and author or co-editor of numerous articles and volumes on medieval and early modern history, theology and philosophy. Since June 2014, he serves as chair of the research group Classic Reformed Theology.

H. (*Henk*) *van den Belt*
(1971), Ph.D. (2006) Leiden University, is Professor of Reformed Theology: Sources, Development, and Context at the University of Groningen. He is the author of *The Authority of Scripture in Reformed Theology: Truth and Trust* (Brill, 2008) and of several articles on Reformed Orthodoxy and on neocalvinism; he also edited *Restoration through Redemption: John Calvin Revisited* (Brill, 2013).

W.A. (*William*) *den Boer*
(1977), Ph.D. (2008) Theological University Apeldoorn, Postdoctoral researcher in Early Modern Reformed Theology at the Theological University Kampen, and Research Associate at the Jonathan Edwards Centre, University of the Free State, South Africa. He is author of *God's Twofold Love. The Theology of Jacob Arminius* (*1559–1609*) (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010), and author or editor of several books and articles on church history and historical theology.

S. (*Simon*) *Burton*
(1983), Ph.D. (2011) University of Edinburgh, is Assistant-Professor of Early Modern Christian Culture at the University of Warsaw. He is the author of *The Hallowing of Logic: The Trinitarian Method of Richard Baxter's* Methodus Theologiae (Brill, 2012), as well as of a number of articles and book chapters on late medieval and Reformed scholasticism.

R.A. (*Riemer*) *Faber*
(1961), Ph.D. (1992) University of Toronto. He is Associate Professor of Classical Studies at the University of Waterloo, and Director of the Waterloo Institute for Hellenistic Studies. His research interests include Greek and Latin philology and literary criticism, and neo-Latin, and he has published widely in these

fields. Most recently he co-edited *Belonging and Isolation in the Hellenistic World* (University of Toronto Press, 2013).

R. (*Rein*) *Ferwerda*
(1937), Ph.D. (1965) VU University Amsterdam. He served as *Rector Gymnasii* in Ede from 1968 until 1993, Visiting Professor of Latin at Hope College, Holland (Michigan) from 1967 until 1968. He is the author of *La signification des images et des métaphores dans la pensée de Plotin* (Wolters, 1965), and has published Dutch translations of the works of Aristotle, Democritus, Diogenes Laertius, Empedocles, Plato, Plotinus and Sextus Empiricus. He has translated also the works of Saint Gregory Palamas, into English. He is the author of *Lof der Scepsis* (Klement, 2003).

P.J. (*Philip*) *Fisk*
(1959), Ph.D. (2015) Evangelische Theologische Faculteit, Leuven, where he is Senior Researcher in Historical Theology. He is the author of *Jonathan Edwards's Turn from the Classic-Reformed Tradition of Freedom of the Will*, New Directions in Jonathan Edwards Studies (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016), and has published peer-reviewed articles on issues pertaining to Reformed Orthodoxy, Jonathan Edwards, and the Reformed- scholastic backdrop to the Harvard and Yale curricula.

A.J. (*Albert*) *Gootjes*
(1979), Ph.D. (2012) Calvin Theological Seminary, is a postdoctoral researcher at Utrecht University. He has authored *Claude Pajon (1626–1685) and the Academy of Saumur: The First Controversy over Grace* (Brill, 2014) and several articles on seventeenth-century French Protestantism. His current research focuses on the Cartesian physician, theologian, and philosopher Lambertus van Velthuysen (1622–1685) and his 'circle' in the city of Utrecht.

H.-J.M.J. (*Harm*) *Goris*
(1960), Ph.D. (1996) Catholic Theological University Utrecht. He is Senior Lecturer at the School of Catholic Theology, Tilburg University. He is the author of *Free Creatures of an Eternal God. Thomas Aquinas on God's Infallible Foreknowledge and Irresistible Will* (Peeters, 1996), and served as co-editor of several books and articles, in particular on the thought of Thomas Aquinas.

H.J. (*Jan*) *van Helden*
(1979), MA (Philosophy, 2007) M.Phil. (Theology, 2011) VU University Amsterdam, Minister of the Nederlands Gereformeerde Kerk at Amsterdam-Centrum.

He is co-editor of the Dutch theological journal *Soteria*, author of several articles on systematic and historical theology, and is preparing a research project on the relation between the sovereignty of God and human freedom in nineteenth century liberal theology and Dutch neo-Calvinism.

C.J. (*Kees Jan*) *van Linden*
(1967) MA (Classical Studies, 1991) Leiden University. He is a Latin and Greek teacher at a secondary school in Kampen. He is preparing a dissertation on the *Statenvertaling* (1637) as a translation project in the seventeenth century European context. His fields of interest are linguistics, translation and hermeneutics. He served as a Bible translation coordinator in Guinea (W-Africa) from 2000 to 2012.

M. (*Matthias*) *Mangold*
(1986), MA (2013) Evangelische Theologische Faculteit, Leuven, is a Ph.D. candidate and a Research Assistant at the Evangelische Theologische Faculteit, Leuven. His current research project focuses on Salomon van Til (1643–1713), a Dutch Reformed theologian in the time of the early Enlightenment.

P.L. (*Pieter*) *Rouwendal*
(1973), MA (2002) Utrecht University. Independent scholar. He is currently completing a dissertation on *Predestination and External Calling in Geneva, From Calvin to Pictet* (VU University Amsterdam). He is the (co-)author of several books and articles on church history and historical theology, including "Calvin's Forgotten Classical Position on the Extent of the Atonement: About Sufficiency, Efficiency and Anachronism" (*Westminster Theological Journal*, 2008), and *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism* (Reformation Heritage Books, 2011).

R.T. (*Dolf*) *te Velde*
(1974), Ph.D. (2010) Theological University Kampen, currently Assistant Professor of Systematic Theology at that university, and Assistant Professor of Historical Theology at the Evangelische Theologische Faculteit Leuven. He is the author of *The Doctrine of God in Reformed Orthodoxy, Karl Barth, and the Utrecht School* (Brill, 2013), and of several articles on systematic and historical theology. He co-edited *Reformed Thought on Freedom* (Baker Academic, 2010), and is the volume-editor of vol. 1 of the present *Synopsis*-edition (2014).

A. (*Antonie*) *Vos*
(1944), Ph.D. (1981) Utrecht University, Research Professor at the Evangelische Theologische Faculteit, Leuven. He has (co-)published widely in philosophy,

the history of medieval philosophy, systematic theology and the historical theology from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, including *Contingency and Freedom* (Springer, 1994), *Duns Scotus on Divine Love* (Ashgate, 2003), and *The Philosophy of John Duns Scotus* (Edinburgh University Press, 2006).

Acknowledgements

On behalf of the research group Classic Reformed Theology (Oude Gereformeerde Theologie), the editors would like to take this opportunity to express their gratitude for the support provided by a number of institutions and individuals.

In particular, we thank the Theologische Universiteit Kampen (TUK), the Theologische Universiteit Apeldoorn (TUA), and the Evangelical Theological Faculty, Leuven (ETF), for sponsoring the research group and its current project, the three-volume edition of the *Synopsis of a Purer Theology*.

Besides giving financial support, the involvement of personnel from these institutions served to propel this project in a timely fashion. We also thank the Gereformeerde Bond (Reformed League) in the Protestant Church in the Netherlands for generously allowing Henk van den Belt, who holds a special chair on behalf of the Gereformeerde Bond in Groningen, to spend a substantial part of his research time in editing this volume.

We thank Stichting Jagtspoel Fonds and the Gereformeerde Bond (Reformed League) in the Protestant Church in the Netherlands for subsidizing some of the publication costs for this volume. The Hervormde Gemeente (Reformed Congregation) of Woudenberg is thanked for welcoming the Classic Reformed Theology research group to use its facilities for its regular plenary meetings to discuss matters of translation, annotation, and explanation.

For effective organizational arrangement the research group was divided into three teams, each of which was responsible for supervising the production of the disputations that comprise the *Synopsis*. We would like to thank the leaders of each team for their role in coordinating the activities of its members and encouraging them in their tasks: Henk van den Belt and "team Utrecht"; Philip J. Fisk and "team Leuven"; and Dolf te Velde and "team Dordrecht." We also thank Antonie Vos, who shared his expertise in scholastic theology and philosophy with all three teams.

The members of the teams are listed in the Notes on Contributors. Special mention is made of the late Willem J. van Asselt, who passed away on Ascension Day, May 29, 2014, four months before the first volume was published. He was one of the first members of the research group Classic Reformed Theology, which was founded by Antonie Vos in 1982 for the purpose of studying early modern scholastic theology. Moreover, he served as its chair for almost twenty-five years until his premature death and initiated several research projects including the Synopsis project, which he supervised with much enthusiasm.

In addition to the team members, we would like to thank several individuals who offered their expertise and time to the project. These include Siebold Schipper, who assisted William den Boer by researching the various editions of the *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* and the separately published disputations and checking the accuracy of the reference to Bible-passages. Rein Ferwerda determined the Latin text and identified explicit and implicit references to classical authors and church fathers. Matthias Mangold is especially thanked for tracing most of the references to the medieval and contemporary theologians and philosophers and the correct references to the critical editions of the church fathers and for taking care of our website (www.classic-reformed-theology.org) that includes information on the research group Classic Reformed Theology and on the Synopsis project. Wilco Veltkamp wrote the brief biographies of the students who served as respondents to the original disputations. We want to thank Benjamin Mayes (Concordia Publishing House) and Michael Lynch (Calvin Theological Seminary) for helping us with some of the footnotes, Gert van den Brink for assisting us with the explanation of some issues in Disputation 28 on the satisfaction through Christ from his expertise in the subject on which he has just finished his dissertation, and Kees Abbink for assisting in comparing some of Walaeus's disputations with the texts in his *Opera omnia*.

Finally we would like to thank Arjan van Dijk, Brill's senior acquisitions editor, as well as editor Ivo Romein and series editor Andrew Colin Gow, Texts & Sources subseries editor Falk Eisermann, and the editorial board of Brill's series *Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions* for their enthusiastic support for this edition, and for their assistance throughout the entire process.

Andreas J. Beck, William den Boer, Riemer A. Faber
March 2016

List of Abbreviations

BLGNP	D. Nauta, and others, eds. *Biografisch Lexicon voor de Geschiedenis van het Nederlands Protestantisme*. 6 vols. Kampen: Kok, 1978–2006.
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum Series Latina. 194 vols. Turnhout: Brepols, 1953–.
CO	Guilielmus Baum, and others, eds. *Joannis Calvini opera quae supersunt omnia*. 59 vols. (Calvini Opera 1–59 = Corpus reformatorum 29–88). Brunswick: Schwetschke, 1863–1900.
CR	Karl Gottlieb Bretschneider, and others, eds. Corpus reformatorum. 101 vols. Halle: Schwetske, 1834–.
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. 95 vols. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1866–.
DLGTT	Richard A. Muller. *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms: Drawn Principally from Protestant Scholastic Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985.
DH	Heinrich Denzinger. (Edited by Peter Hünermann, based on the 32th edition by Adolf Schönmetzer, 1963.) *Enchiridion symbolorum definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum*. 43rd ed. Freiburg: Herder, 2010. English translation, edited by Robert Fastiggi and Anne Englund Nash: *Compendium of Creeds, Definitions, and Declarations on Matters of Faith and Morals*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2012.
FC	Fontes Christiani. Freiburg: Herder / Turnhout: Brepols, 1990–.
GCS	Die griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs and Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1897–.
LCL	The Loeb Classical Library, at present edited by Jeffrey Henderson. 521 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1911–.
MPG	J.P. Migne, ed. Patrologiae Cursus Completus Series Graeca. 161 vols. Paris: Garnier, 1857–1866.
MPL	J.P. Migne, ed. Patrologiae Cursus Completus Series Latina. 221 vols. Paris: Sirou, 1844–1865.
NNBW	P.C. Molhuysen and P.J. Blok, eds. *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek*. 10 vols. Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff, 1911–1937.
NPNF1	Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, eds. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. First series. Reprint; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995.
NPNF2	Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, eds. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Second series. Reprint; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995.
OS	Petrus Barth and Wilhelm Niesel, eds. *Ioannis Calvini Opera Selecta*. 5 vols. Munich: Kaiser, 1926–1936.
PRRD	Richard A. Muller. *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics: The Rise and*

	Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, ca. 1520 to ca. 1725. 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003.
RC	Thomas Rees, trans. and ed., *The Racovian Catechism, with Notes and Illustrations, Translated from the Latin: To Which is Prefixed a Sketch of the History of Unitarianism in Poland and the Adjacent Countries*. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, & Brown, 1818.
RTF	Willem J. van Asselt, J. Martin Bac, and Roelf T. te Velde, eds. *Reformed Thought on Freedom: The Concept of Free Choice in the History of Early-Modern Reformed Theology*. Texts and Studies in Reformation and Post-Reformation Thought. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010.
SC	Sources Chrétiennes. Paris: Cerf, 1942–.
SPT	*Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* [the present work].
USTC	Universal Short Title Catalogue. Hosted by the University of St Andrews. http://ustc.ac.uk/index.php.
VD16	Verzeichnis der im deutschen Sprachbereich erschienenen Drucke des 16. Jahrhunderts. www.vd16.de
VD17	Verzeichnis der im deutschen Sprachbereich erschienenen Drucke des 17. Jahrhunderts. www.vd17.de
WA	Ulrich Köpf, and others, eds. D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe. 127 vols. Weimar: Böhlau, 1883–2009.
WCF	*Westminster Confession of Faith*. In Philip Schaff, ed., and David S. Schaff, rev., *The Creeds of Christendom: With a History and Critical Notes*, vol. 3, *The Evangelical Protestant Creeds*, 598–673. 6th ed., Grand Rapids: Baker, 1990.

Introduction

The *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* offers a survey of academic theology in the Reformed church shortly after its codification at the international Synod of Dort (1618–1619), occasioned by the clash with the Remonstrants in the Dutch Republic.[1] The summary of Reformed Orthodox theology originated from a series of disputations written by four Leiden professors of theology and publically defended by their students. The editors of this new bilingual edition have divided the 52 disputations into three parts, including the disputations 1–23 in the first, the disputations 23–42 in the second, and the disputations 43–52 in the third volume.

The disputations collected in the first volume laid the scriptural foundation of theology and discussed the doctrine of the Triune God, the creation of the world and humanity, sin, and finally the way in which God addresses human beings in Law and Gospel. The nineteen disputations in this second volume deal with different aspects of the doctrines of salvation: predestination (disputation 24), the person and work of Christ (25–29), the effectuation of salvation by God's calling and the human response in faith and repentance (30–32), justification and sanctification (33–38), a polemical disputation on purgatory (39), and ecclesiology (40–42). The final volume will contain ten more disputations on the sacraments, church discipline and church councils, the civil government, and eschatology.

This introduction first discusses the structure of the *Synopsis*, then summarizes the content of the present volume, highlighting a few important aspects of Reformed soteriology from the details of the disputations, reflects on the sources of the disputations and the differences in style between the four authors, and finally offers some information on the repetitions of the disputation cycle represented in the *Synopsis*.

1 For a short introduction to the historical background of the *Synopsis* see Dolf te Velde, "Introduction," in Dolf te Velde (ed.), *Synopsis purioris theologiae = Synopsis of a Purer Theology*, volume 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 1–22. For more details on historical aspects see Donald Sinnema and Henk van den Belt, "The *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* (1625) as a Disputation Cycle," *Church History and Religious Culture* 92.4 (2012): 505–537. The final volume of the *Synopsis* series will include an extensive historical and theological introduction to the whole work.

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2016 | DOI: 10.1163/9789004328679_002

1 The Structure of the *Synopsis*

It is not certain if publication of the cycle as a textbook was already contemplated when the cycle started in February 1620, but the structure of the *Synopsis* was agreed upon beforehand by Johannes Polyander (1568–1646), Antonius Walaeus (1573–1639), and Antonius Thysius (1565–1640). Andreas Rivetus (1572–1651), who joined the staff only in the fall of 1620, was not involved in planning the cycle.

The *Synopsis* cycle continues a tradition of cycles of theological disputations that began in 1596. A comparison with the six cycles of disputations held prior to the Synod of Dort reveals some remarkable choices of the authors of the *Synopsis*.[2] The first cycle was followed by five repetitions (*repetitiones*) in which the number of disputations and the topics differ. The last repetition ended abruptly in 1609 with the death of Arminius.

After more than ten years—and after the Synod of Dort—Polyander and his colleagues decided to start a new series of disputations to replace the original cycle and its repetitions. A comparison of the structure of this new cycle and previous ones reveals that the most remarkable change with respect to soteriology is the place of predestination in the series.

In the original cycle, initiated by Franciscus Junius (1545–1602), the disputation on predestination was connected to the one on providence, immediately following the Trinity and Christology. In the first repetition, both Christology and predestination move back and predestination ends up in the last part of soteriology only followed by the calling and eschatology. In the second repetition however predestination moves forward again and is again joined with providence. In the third to the fifth repetitions, however, it moves back to soteriology again.

The authors of the *Synopsis* make a new choice. They do not connect predestination with the doctrine of God or with providence, but they do not place it together with the calling at the end of soteriology either. The place of predestination in the manner of presentation (*ordo docendi*) of a theological system as such does not determine the content of the doctrine, as the participation of both Arminius and Gomarus in previous cycles illustrates.[3]

---

2 For a more extensive discussion of this issue and the lists of the six cycles prior to the *Synopsis*, including the lists of the titles in the cycles see Henk van den Belt, "Developments in Structuring of Reformed Theology: The *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* (1625) as Example," in *Reformation und Rationalität*, eds. Herman Selderhuis and Ernst-Joachim Waschke (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 289–312.

3 On this issue with regards to John Calvin's *Institutes* see Richard A. Muller, "Establishing

The *Synopsis* places predestination at the beginning of soteriology, or, as Thysius says, between the disputation "On the Gospel" and the disputations on "the object of the Gospel and the basis for the new covenant, namely, the person of Christ, or the incarnation of the Son of God, and the personal union of the two natures of Christ" (*SPT* 25.1).

2 Reformed Soteriology

Reformed soteriology expressed in these disputations should be understood within the framework of the theological context of the whole *Synopsis*. The doctrine of grace can be seen as the heart of Reformed theology, but it is not the whole body. Thus, for instance, Christology (disputations 25–29) is connected to the doctrine of God (disputations 7–9), the concept of faith and repentance (disputations 31–32) presupposes what has been said on the creation of human beings in the image of God, on sin and free will (disputations 13–17), and, above all, Reformed soteriology is pilgrim-theology based on God's revelation in Scripture (disputations 1–5).

2.1 *Predestination*

The disputation on predestination (24) opens with the statement that although the doctrine is difficult, the church should not remain silent about it, because the Bible speaks about it and because it is a comforting doctrine. Walaeus acknowledges that the word 'predestination' can be taken in a more general sense for divine providence or more specifically as a reference to the "ordination of persons for a specific supernatural goal" (*SPT* 24.5). Though in that sense Scripture reserves 'predestination' exclusively for election, it can refer to both reprobation and election, if both categories are treated dissimilarly.

Following Jacobus Arminius, the Remonstrants understood election as the eternal decree of God to save believers, making salvation depend on foreseen faith. They explicitly rejected the supralapsarian view of Reformed theologians like Theodore Beza (1519–1605), Calvin's successor in Geneva, William Perkins (1558–1602), and Franciscus Gomarus, who placed predestination before or

---

the Ordo docendi: The Organization of Calvin's Institutes, 1536–1559," in: Richard A. Muller, *The Unaccommodated Calvin: Studies in the Foundation of a Theological Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 118–139 and Richard A. Muller, "The Placement of Predestination in Reformed Theology: Issue or Non-Issue?" *CTJ* 40 (2005): 184–210.

above (*supra*) the fall in the logical order of God's eternal decree. According to the Synod of Dort, however, the Arminians misrepresented the supralapsarian view, turning predestination into a caricature and offered a solution that contradicted the free grace of God, expressed in Scripture and accepted as orthodox in the catholic Church from Augustine onward.

Synod of Dort

The Synod of Dort expressed the doctrine of predestination in an infralapsarian way. The *Canons of Dort* open with the acknowledgment that all human beings are sinners and deserve to be rejected by God, turning immediately to the love of God manifested in the Gospel (*Canons of Dort* 1, 1–3).

The infralapsarians place predestination after or below (*infra*) the fall in the logical order of God's decree. They differ from the supralapsarians with respect to the "object of predestination" and give different answers to the question who were predestinated. Did God simply predestinate human beings, or did He predestinate them while considering the fall? According to the supralapsarians, the object of predestination consisted of possible human beings, irrespective of sin. According to the infralapsarians the object of predestination consisted of fallen human beings, who were either chosen by God or left behind in their fallen state.

At the synod, Walaeus had joined his future colleagues Polyander and Thysius in defending infralapsarianism against Gomarus, the major proponent of the supralapsarian position at the synod. Gomarus agreed with them on the issue of election, except for the precise object of predestination.[4] The synod did not reject the supralapsarian view, but preferred the infralapsarian view as more certain and more in agreement with the Word of God.[5]

In the *Synopsis* Walaeus takes the infralapsarian perspective: "Holy Scripture always passes from election to redemption or calling but never from election to creation in the image of God or to the fall and permission and ordering of sin, as those who 'ascend higher' are forced to state" (*SPT* 24.22). Those who ascend higher are the supralapsarians.

---

4 Donald Sinnema, Christian Moser, and Herman J. Selderhuis (ed.), *Acta of the Synod of Dordt* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 1:134.

5 Antonius Walaeus, *Opera omnia* (Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643), 1:327a; cf. Gisbertus Voetius, *Selectae disputationes*, vol. 5 (Utrecht: Antonius Smytegelt, 1669), 602–607, Andreas J. Beck, *Gisbertus Voetius (1589–1676): Sein Theologieverständnis und seine Gotteslehre*. Forschungen zur Theologie- und Dogmengeschichte, 98 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), 101.

Walaeus defines election as "the eternal and immutable decree of God whereby He chooses from the whole human race that had fallen by its own fault from pristine integrity into sin and destruction a specific number of individual people (neither better nor more worthy than others) solely out of his own good pleasure, unto salvation in Christ Jesus" (*SPT* 24.14). The phrasing closely follows the definition of election of the *Canons of Dort*, I, 7, without exactly copying it.

Remonstrants

Referring to the Remonstrants, Walaeus says that some "who want to be members of the Reformed church" hold that God elected only those people whose faith and perseverance He had foreseen (*SPT* 24.34). This view would be acceptable if they would acknowledge that faith and perseverance are gifts of God, granted on the basis of grace to those who are to be saved (*SPT* 24.35). The Remonstrants, however, ascribed faith and perseverance partly to God and partly to human free will and this position, according to Walaeus, did not differ from the Pelagianism that the Church had rejected as heretical.

To explain that election and reprobation are dissimilar, Walaeus uses the scholastic distinction between negative and affirmative reprobation. In the former God is not active in the strict sense of the word; negative stands for "without a positive act of the will." Reprobation does not mean that God has decided to have no mercy on some people, but that He has refrained from deciding to have mercy on them (*SPT* 24.50). Affirmative reprobation is a 'positive' act of God's will, namely his decree to punish sinners. The *Synopsis*, which offers an academic theological reflection on the decisions of the synod, defined reprobation both as the decree of God to leave some sinners in their self-chosen misery and as the decree to punish them on account of their unbelief and other sins (*Canons of Dort*, I, 15).

Although the academic disputations in general do not deal with the more pastoral aspects of the faith, Walaeus stresses that the doctrine of election teaches humility, is a basis of trust, a source of joy and hope, and a ground for consolation. These advantages only have a full impact if the believers have assurance of their election, based on its effects, "which pious people discover in themselves with joy, following serious self-examination" (*SPT* 24.42).

2.2 *Christology*

The *Synopsis* discusses Christology in an important cluster of disputations not only covering the incarnation and the doctrine of Christ's two Natures (25), but also the threefold office of Christ (26), the states of his humiliation and exaltation (27 and 28) and the satisfaction accomplished by Christ as the

foundation of redemption and salvation (29). The reason that the Father and the Son were treated in one disputation (8) apparently lies in the fact that the extensive discussion of Christology was reserved for the context of soteriology in the planned structure of the *Synopsis*.

The disputation on the Incarnation and the union of the two natures in Christ (25) stresses that in the incarnation the Son of God humbled himself, taking upon himself in the unity of his person flesh from the virgin Mary, through the Spirit's activity. In this way the person of Christ, the God-and-man, is constituted, for the purpose of reconciling the elect with God and uniting them to him. The disputation closes with five explicit "antitheses" in which the opinions of the Jews, pseudo-Christians like the Arians, and those who attack the classical understanding of the hypostatic union, such as the Ubiquitarians, are rejected.

In the disputation on the office of Christ (26) Polyander acknowledges that this office—note the singular—has three aspects: prophetic, priestly and royal. In his office, the Mediator Christ expiated our sins through his obedience on the altar of the cross. The Socinians are accused of holding that satisfaction through the death of Christ is not necessary for our salvation. Polyander closes the discussion of the royal aspect of Christ's office with an eschatological perspective: Christ will hand over all the elect together with his mediatorial scepter to his Father (*SPT* 26.53).

Humiliation and Exaltation

Turning to Christ's humiliation (27) and exaltation (28), the *Synopsis* discusses both in three parallel steps: his suffering, crucifixion, and death, his burial, and his descent into hell are related to his resurrection, his ascension, and his session at the Father's right hand in a chiastic structure. In Christ's separation from God on the cross the Father turned against Christ by withholding his favor from him, not by rejecting him entirely, Rivetus explains, referring to the scholastic distinction between the willing of what is righteous and the willing of what is pleasant (*SPT* 27.8). The nuanced discussion of the descent into hell surprisingly ends with explaining this as a reference to the state of death and not to the hellish anguish on the cross, although the alternative interpretation in some public Catechisms should not be rejected (*SPT* 27.32).

The disputation on Christ's humiliation contains a clear statement regarding the extent of Christ's atonement. The Gospel indiscriminately proclaims salvation to all to whom it is sent, but only those who believe in Christ partake of that salvation. The value of Christ's suffering and death is sufficient for the redemption of all people, but "the life-giving and saving efficacy of Christ's suffering and death manifests itself only in those who believe, to bestow

upon them justifying faith and by means of it to lead them on to their salvation with certainty" (*SPT* 27.23).[6]

Although there are quite a few polemical theses in this part of the *Synopsis*, nevertheless the disputations are not dominated by the discussions with Lutherans, Anabaptists, and Socinians, but rather characterized by a positive reference to and exposition of the applicable texts from Scripture. The disputation on the Satisfaction by Jesus Christ (29), for instance, could have been loaded with criticism of the Socinians, but in fact it contains many exegetical remarks, such as the references to texts that show that Christ performed the satisfaction willingly and without any compulsion (*SPT* 29.7), and the references to Old Testament sacrifices.

2.3 *The Effectuation of Redemption*

Turning to the efficacious work of the Holy Spirit in the elect, the *Synopsis* opens with a disputation on the calling to salvation (30).[7] According to Polyander, in the special calling (*vocatio specialis*) God calls some people to a supernatural knowledge of Christ away from the corruptions of this world through the Gospel and the power of the Holy Spirit (*SPT* 30.5).

The special calling occurs both outwardly through the ministry of the Word and the sacraments and inwardly through the work of the Holy Spirit, although God is free to call some even without the external Word. Whether or not the calling is effective does not depend on the fact whether it is internal, but on the way in which both sides of the calling go together. They can concur either effectively, leading to saving faith, or in an ineffective way as the parable of the sower shows. The calling is only effective in those "in whom the Holy Spirit implants the full assurance or confidence of a living faith that is rooted in Christ" (the seed in the good soil) (*SPT* 30.35–38).

The efficacious calling is not forced, but "sweet," because it turns the crooked will in such a way that from unwilling it becomes willing. This resembles the "very powerful yet very sweet, wonderful hidden and unspeakable operation" of which the *Canons of Dort* (III/IV, 11–12) speak.

---

6 The distinction between the sufficiency of Christ's passion for the redemption of all people and its efficacy for the believers reflects the *Canons of Dort* II:2, 8, though there the efficacy is related to election, here to faith.

7 For a comparison of this disputation with previous and later Leiden disputations on the issue see Henk van den Belt, "The Vocatio in the Leiden Disputations (1597–1631): The Influence of the Arminian Controversy on the Concept of the Divine Call to Salvation," *Church History and Religious Culture*, 92.4 (2012), 539–559.

Faith and Perseverance

Because the content was so abundant and distinct, the disputation on Faith and Perseverance (31) required a double defense. In both cases the responding student was Paul Testard (c. 1596–1650), a student and admirer of the Saumur theologian John Cameron (c. 1579–1625).[8] Rivetus attacks Cameron in this disputation for holding that the will necessarily follows the intellect in conversion. This is one of the cases in which the text of the *Synopsis* is in fact more polemical than it appears to be at first glance. Knowledge of contemporary debates is very important for the correct understanding of the specific position taken in the *Synopsis*, especially when the opponents are only mentioned in general or not at all.

Rivetus defines saving faith as "a firm assent—based on the certain knowledge of divine revelation—implanted in our minds by the Holy Spirit through the Word of the Gospel, an assent to everything that God has revealed to us in his Word, and especially to the promises of life that were made in Christ" (*SPT* 31.6). It is only by this faith that believers rely on God. This justifying faith is to be distinguished from historical faith, which still is always connected to it, from temporary faith, and from faith in miracles.

Regarding the assurance of salvation, Rivetus holds that believers should "be certain that their own sins have been forgiven and that they have been reconciled through Christ" (*SPT* 31.20). To attain this certainty it is not necessary that salvation is declared to us personally, because believers can conclude that their sins are forgiven from the general promise of forgiveness to all who believe in Christ, and from the fact that they believe. This is the so-called practical syllogism. From the promise of the Gospel (the major) and the self-consciousness regarding personal faith, 'I believe' (the minor), believers can conclude that the promise is true for them in particular. The certainty of the minor was disputed by Roman Catholic opponents, but according to Rivetus, the affirmation "I believe" is from the Holy Spirit, who witnesses to the spirit of believers that they are children of God.

Rivetus defines perseverance as "the continuous, perpetual progress and successful endurance of true believers, through the grace and justifying faith once received, right unto the end of life, thanks to the gracious will according to God's eternal plan of election" (*SPT* 31.33). It is bestowed on them without any merit from their side by the power of the Spirit through the Gospel.

---

8 The original disputation is dated July 13 and 16, 1622; for a picture of the frontispiece see the cover of this volume.

Repentance

In the disputation on repentance (32) Walaeus distinguishes between repentance in the broad sense including regeneration—a disposition (*habitus*) poured into our hearts by the Holy Spirit—and repentance in the strict sense of a human act of sorrow for sin that flows from that disposition. The answer to the question whether faith is part of repentance depends on the definition. In the broad sense it is, for then repentance denotes the whole set of changes worked by the Holy Spirit; but taken in the strict sense, faith is the cause and repentance the effect.

After having explained regeneration as a renewal of the whole human soul, "with all its faculties, including intellect, will and affections" (*SPT* 32.18), Walaeus turns to penitence, or active repentance, not only warning against the Roman Catholic misunderstanding that repentance is meritorious, but also taking issue with the Anabaptist disciplinary practice that excludes public sinners from the communion of the church during their repentance.

2.4 *Justification and Sanctification*

The *Synopsis* divides the efficacious work or saving of God in the believers into God's calling together with the human response in faith and repentance on the one hand and the effects of that calling and response in justification and sanctification on the other hand. Sanctification is dealt with in six disputations: on good works, on Christian liberty, on the practices of prayer, almsgiving and fasting, and vows, ending with an explicitly anti-Roman Catholic disputation on purgatory and indulgences.

The disputation on justification (33) defines it as "the judgment of God whereby He pronounces righteous the person who is unholy and of himself a sinner subject to God's wrath" (*SPT* 33.7). According to Thysius we are justified by the Father as judge seated on a throne of grace, in Christ who has made satisfaction and acts as our advocate and through the Holy Spirit who grants faith and seals grace in our hearts by the Gospel (*SPT* 33.37).

This disputation by Thysius also includes explicit antitheses, primarily against Roman Catholic theologians who reject a forensic understanding of justification, interpreting the term as a reference to the infusion of the quality of righteousness. According to Thysius the principal cause of justification, however, is not an infused habit of love, but the imputation of the merit and satisfaction of Christ and consequently the participation of the believer in Christ's righteousness through faith.

Good Works

Good works (34), according to Polyander, are "the actions of regenerate people that come about according to the precept of God's Law, out of faith that works through love, for the confirmation of our election and calling, for the upbuilding of our neighbor, and to the glory of God" (*SPT* 34.2). That God is their primary efficient cause does not exclude those who are renewed by the Holy Spirit as a secondary causes. Good works have three goals: the confirmation of our election and calling, the upbuilding of our neighbor, and the glory of God, to which goal the other two are subordinate.

Good works render the election and calling unto salvation of the believers more certain. In other words, they confirm the minor of the practical syllogism, explained in the disputation on faith as the core of assurance. If you want to know for sure if you believe, faith is confirmed by its fruits.

Liberty

The topic of Christian Freedom (35)—"the condition of people who have been set free by the grace of Christ, a condition whereby their consciences have been released from slavery to sin, the tyranny of the devil, and from the precise demands and curse of the moral law, and from observing the ceremonial law" (*SPT* 35.7)—is interesting for Reformed biblical hermeneutics, because it presupposes the distinction between the moral and the ceremonial parts of the Law. According to Rivetus, the juridical or political parts of the Mosaic Law that are sanctioned by the universal principles of nature and common sense, remain permanently.

Most of the disputations in the *Synopsis* are structured along the lines of the four different causes (*causae*): the efficient cause, the formal cause or "form," the material cause or "matter," and the final cause or goal. This scheme originated from Aristotelian philosophy and was adapted to theology in medieval scholasticism, though it was emptied of its original ontological connotations.[9] The efficient cause and the final cause of all things are always identified as God—except, of course, for evil, which in fact is a 'no-thing,' a non-entity, because it does not have an independent substance. In order to be able to discern subordinate human causes as well, often an instrumental cause is subjoined to God as the ultimate efficient cause.

Disputation 35 suffices as an illustration of the 'causal' structure of the disputations:

9 Cf. Te Velde, *SPT* vol. 1, "Introduction," 5.

1) Introduction and place of the disputation in the series.
2) Importance of the doctrine.
3–6) The nature and different forms of slavery and freedom.
7) Definition of Christian freedom.
8) The chief *efficient cause*: God.
9) Two aspects of the efficient *instrumental cause*: the Gospel and a living faith.
10) The *material cause* or the matter of Christian freedom (on the side of the subject): everyone who believes in Christ.
11–17) The matter (or the side of the object) is manifold: a) sin and guilt, b) the moral law, c) human traditions.
18–19) Christian Liberty is spiritual and does not apply to politics.
20) Christian Freedom under the New Testament.
21–27) Freedom from the ceremonial law.
28–31) Freedom from the judicial laws of Moses.
32–40) Things that are indifferent.
41) The *formal cause* or form of Christian liberty.
42) Christian liberty's *final cause*: the proximate goal in the tranquility of conscience and the ultimate goal in the praise of God's grace.
43–44) The freedom of glory.
45–47) Manifold use of the doctrine.
48) Polemical statement against 'Jewish' chiliasm.
49) Polemical statement against Roman Catholics and Socinians.

The disputation mainly deals with the ceremonial laws and the *adiaphora*—covering almost 30 of the 49 theses—but in the structure of the four causes, this all belongs to the matter of the Christian freedom, introduced in thesis 10. Christian liberty is the essence of the full assurance (*plērophoria*) of a conscience that knows that there is no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus.

Prayer, Almsgiving and Fasting

With respect to prayer (36) Walaeus claims that Roman Catholics pray to angels and dead saints, contrary to all God's commandments. Repentance, humility, filial fear of God, true faith, and a true desire are necessary aspects of prayer. Public prayers should be audible—contrary to some Anabaptists who prayed silently in worship services—and in a language that can be understood—contrary to the Latin liturgy of Roman Catholics. Needless repetition of words is prohibited.

Almsgiving and fasting (37) and vows (38) are other aspects of the Christian life. The *Synopsis* relates the three topics to prayer. Almsgiving is an act of

charity towards one's neighbor from one's own goods and in proportion to one's financial resources and should proceed out of true faith and burning love for God and for one's neighbor in the hope of obtaining a divine reward (*SPT* 37.3).

Fasting is a prescription for Christians, but in its circumstances it is voluntary. In fasting they abstain "from all food and drink, and all the customary trappings of life [...] at least for a day, in order to arouse and assist the soul and spirit in prayer" (*SPT* 37.39). It should be done religiously in humility before God with repentance for sin.

Vows

A vow, according to Polyander, is a voluntary promise made to God "of our own doing, and by faith, for the glory of his name and the upbuilding of our neighbor" (*SPT* 38.3). The discussion of vows is closely linked to disputation 20 on oaths, because vows are oaths about future things. More remarkable even is a minor difference of opinion within the *Synopsis* with respect to vows, the subject Polyander deals with in disputation 38. Because vows belong to the promissory category of oaths, they already had been discussed by Walaeus in disputation 20 in the context of explaining the third commandment. There Walaeus discerns a special difficulty with respect to uttering vows about intermediate matters. If these matters are left explicitly to human freedom in Scripture, one is not allowed to vow to abstain from them permanently.

Polyander in disputation 38 seems to be less explicit on this issue, only claiming that vows on *adiaphora*—such as celibacy and abstaining from certain food and drink—are to be condemned if they conflict with the freedom that Christ has obtained for us (*SPT* 38.37). Vows regarding indifferent things are allowed if they are uttered in the right attitude, free of superstition, and with the right aims.

The difference between the two disputations should not, however, be exaggerated, because also Walaeus allowed for vows uttered with respect to the *adiaphora*. They are permitted as long as they are meant to avoid becoming a stumbling-block for others or licentiousness for our own flesh. "But daring to do this in a different way or for a different purpose is a superstition that Christians ought to shun" (*SPT* 20.45).

Purgatory and Indulgences

The disputation about purgatory and indulgences (39) has a special character. Whereas almost all disputations contain polemical theses, this one is completely dedicated to the rejection of a Roman Catholic doctrine and practice. Rivetus calls it an "elenctic disputation" and connects it to the discussion of the

efficacy of Christ's satisfaction in justification and the works of sanctification, especially because purgatory contradicts the unique and complete satisfaction of Christ.

He trusts that "once the fire of purgatory has been extinguished, the smoke of indulgences vanishes by itself" (*SPT* 39.37). Obviously this disputation is not structured along the lines of the four 'causes' or aspects, because it does not discuss something that is seen as part of reality. The disputation ends with a reference to the Reformation, thanking God that He "raised up Martin Luther" (*SPT* 39.54).

2.5 *Ecclesiology* (*40–42*)

The last three disputations in this volume partly deal with Reformed ecclesiology. In his discussion of the church (40), Walaeus defines the 'Ecclesia' etymologically as "the meeting of those whom God in his grace calls out from the state of nature into the supernatural state of children of God, in order to show his glorious mercy" (*SPT* 40.3). Thus he connects the doctrine of the church with the first aspect of the effectuation of redemption in the believers: the divine calling unto salvation.

According to Walaeus the invisible Church is the multitude of elect believers of which the inner form (consisting of true faith and holiness) is not seen by human eyes, by mortal people. The visible church is "the gathering of those who through the outward Word, the use of the sacraments and church discipline, are formed together into one outward body and fellowship" (*SPT* 40.32).

A church simply errs when it fosters false teachings that do not ruin the foundation of the faith, but it is heretical when it errs in fundamental articles and persists in error and schismatic behavior when it unnecessarily breaks the communion because of outward rites or moral failings. Christians are not allowed to join a church that is heretical or schismatic. The marks of the pure and visible Church are "the pure preaching, and reception, of the Word, sealed by the lawful use of the sacraments, and upheld by the true use of the keys (or church discipline), according to the institution by Christ" (*SPT* 40.45).

Antichrist

Turning to Christ as Head of the Church, and the Antichrist (41), Thysius denies that the bishop of Rome has authority over the Church and claims that Christ is her only Sovereign and that he is the Head from which—according to the understandings of early modern anatomy—life flows down into the body. This sovereignty "also exists in his governance and control over it by the Spirit through his Word, and that not only by internal administration but also by

the external one, which is in the calling and sending forth of ministers, and in their instruction through his Word" (*SPT* 41.15), anticipating the following disputation.

In the following disputation Polyander summarizes the Reformed view of the calling and duties of those who minister to the Church (42). This calling "is made known not only by the Holy Spirit's prior inward prompting and inspiration, but also by the subsequent outward approval of the genuine members of the Church" (*SPT* 42.4). Whereas most disputations end with some quotations—mostly from church fathers—as a corollary,[10] this disputation adds a few questions and answers on specific issues, such as the question how Christ handed the key of David down to Peter, with the reply that Christ still holds the key as Lord of the Church but that Peter received it from him as a faithful steward.

3 Sources

Compared to other disputations at the beginning of the seventeenth century, those of the *Synopsis* cycle still refer frequently to the sources of theological allies or opponents, although the four authors write their disputations in various styles and do not all give equally extensive references.

The most important source of the *Synopsis* is Scripture. The genre of the academic disputation is not very well suited for extensive exegetical remarks, but that does not mean that the method is one of mere prooftexting. The authors of the *Synopsis* were interested in correct biblical exegesis.

Rivetus, for instance, taught Old Testament, wrote commentaries on Exodus and on the Psalms.[11] Walaeus was involved in the translation and annotation of the New Testament for the Dutch translation of the Bible, the *Statenvertaling*. In the disputation on Christ's incarnation, Thysius, for example, argues that the human nature of Christ had "accidental properties which can be separated from it and which can be altered or even removed altogether." This is a scholastic expression of the development and growth of Christ according to his human

10 Corollaries are loosely added to the argument of the disputation; the suggestion in volume 1 (*Synopsis* 1:149, note 15) that they were added to the main text of the disputations after the oral defense is not substantiated by the original pamphlets, in which the corollaries seem to be a padding of empty pages.

11 Andreas Rivetus, *Commentarii in librum secundum Mosis* (Leiden: Franciscus Hegerus, 1634) and Andreas Rivetus, *Commentarius in Psalmorum propheticorum, de mysteriis evangelicis, dodecadem selectam* (Rotterdam: Arnoldus Leers, 1645).

nature. Thysius refers to Isaiah 7:16, where the prophet says that the Messiah as a boy will not know enough to reject the wrong and choose the right and to Luke 2:40, where the evangelist says that the child grew, became strong, and was filled with wisdom (*SPT* 25.13).

Sometimes the disputations refer to the apocrypha, for instance to Jesus Sirach (*SPT* 34.42). Polyander, however, adds the warning that the book is not a self-authenticating witness. 1 Maccabees (2:58) is said to confirm Elijah's ascension to heaven (2 Kings 2:11), but the editors of the 1642 edition of the *Synopsis* (*SPT* 40.15) add that "the accepted interpretation of the Jews confirms it (1 Maccabees 2:58)." In some cases a reference to an apocryphal book might have been part of a list of common references, for instance when Thysius mentions among the ritual actions to indicate grief during fasting "pulling out one's hair and beard" with a reference to Esther 14:2, an apocryphal part of Esther, where the Septuagint says that Esther filled all the places of her joy with her torn hair (*SPT* 37.53).

Among the church fathers Augustine is most favorite, but Cyprian, for instance, is also mentioned a few times, especially in the context of ecclesiology and the offices in the church. Most of the explicit references to church fathers occur in the disputations defended under Rivetus who was the author of a patristic manual which became a Protestant classic.[12] Further study of this subject might offer some insights into the way in which the tradition of the early Church was appealed to next to Scripture, especially in polemical debates with Roman Catholic theologians.

Contemporary Opponents and Allies

Contemporary authors are referred to explicitly when the Leiden professors disagree with them and want to refute their errors. Therefore the polemical

12 Andreas Rivetus, *Critici Sacri Libri IV. In quibus expenduntur, confirmantur, defenduntur, vel reiiciuntur censurae doctorum tam ex orthodoxis quam ex pontificiis, in scripta quae patribus plerisque priscorum et posteriorum et puriorum saeculorum incogitantia vel error afinxit aut dolus malus supposuit. Praefixus est tractatus de patrum autoritate, errorum causis et nothorum notis*, 4th edition (Geneva: Jacobus Chouet, 1642). It was first published in or around 1612 and went through several editions. According to Irena Backus it is a "moderate and reasoned call for a critical and historical assessment of the church fathers before one appeals to their authority in works of Biblical exegesis or controversy." See Irena Backus, "The Bible and the Fathers according to Abraham Scultetus (1566–1624) and André Rivet (1571/73–1651). The case of Basil of Caesarea," in *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West. From the Carolingians to the Maurists*, ed. Irena Backus (Boston/Leiden: Brill, 2001), 2:839–865.

parts of the disputations and the elenctic disputation on purgatory and indulgences contain more references to contemporary authors than the other parts of the *Synopsis*. Among the Roman Catholic authors Robert Bellarmine (1542–1621) and Gregory of Valencia (c. 1550–1603) are noteworthy opponents. Fausto Sozzini (1539–1604) is also mentioned—sometimes with a pun on his name called "the miscreant (*infaustus*) Socinus"—along with some of his disciples and the Racovian Catechism (1605). Careful comparison with the original texts of Roman Catholic or Socinian authors might reveal that they are sometimes quoted eclectically, as is the case in many polemical debates.

Reformers and contemporary Protestant theologians often are not referred to explicitly. They are allies who are either silently copied or just mentioned in general because of holding a differing opinion. Thus in the disputation "On Christian Freedom" (35) Rivetus claims that the importance of the doctrine is such "that if we do not keep it then we will not be able to rightly know Christ, the true Gospel, nor inward peace in our souls" (*SPT* 35.2), a verbatim quotation from John Calvin's *Institutes* (3.19.1).[13]

Arguments used against opponents, however, were also often copied from similar sources, some of them gaining the status of polemical common places. The elenctic disputation "On Purgatory and Indulgences" (39) contains many references and expressions that are similar to those of Johann Gerhard's discussion of purgatory in his series *Loci theologici*, first published in 1621.[14] In general it is difficult to decide whether the text of a disputation depends on an earlier polemical work from the Protestant side, or whether both texts depend on the same earlier work as a source. In this case the conclusion that Rivetus was silently using Gerhard's much more extensive text is hardly avoidable.

Further Reseacrh

Study of the sources of the *Synopsis* or comparisons of its disputations with contemporary texts of the same genre may prove to be promising avenues for further research. Just like the cycles of disputations prior to the Synod of Dort, the *Synopsis* series was repeated four times up to 1639. The most important difference between these repetitions and the cycles prior to the Synod of Dort is that the list of subjects remained fixed. This fact alone testifies to the influence of the *Synopsis* as a textbook on later theological instruction at Leiden. For

13 For a more precise comparison with Calvin see Henk van den Belt, "Spiritual and Bodily Freedom: Christian Liberty in Early Modern Reformed Theology," *Journal of Reformed Theology* 9 (2015): 148–165.

14 Johann Gerhard, *Loci theologici* (Jena: Steinmann, 1610–1625), chapter 26. Cf. Johann Gerhard, *Loci theologici* (Berlin: Schlawitz, 1863–1870), 8:132–226.

the development of Reformed theology studies on the influence and reception of the *Synopsis* may be very promising, too, as is illustrated by the recent study of Rinse Reeling Brouwer on Karl Barth's reception of the *Synopsis* in his view of the doctrines of Scripture, the Trinity, providence, predestination and incarnation.[15]

4 Features of the Edition

An introduction to the Latin text has been offered in the first volume. Therefore, in this volume a few remarks will suffice. The current edition takes as its starting point the text of the 1625 edition, though for the sake of consistency and readability, this text has been adapted slightly in aspects of orthography and punctuation. The primary aim is to present a text that is most accessible to the present-day reader. A careful comparison of variants in the texts of the original pamphlets and the five seventeenth-century editions has yielded a very small number of significant textual variants, and these have been noted.

Original printer's errors are corrected without mention, including references to the Bible which in the 1625 edition were incorrect. In some cases the differences between the first edition and later ones are given in a footnote. In light of the authors' desire to base their theology on Scripture, it is surprising that Scripture is not always referred to very accurately. The original disputations contain many errors that are mostly copied in the printed editions of the *Synopsis*; apparently the authors and printers did not take time to check them before reprinting the material. Most of these errors have been silently corrected in this edition, but in those cases in which it was difficult to make sense of the original intention, a footnote has been added to explain this.

The seventeenth century editions of the *Synopsis* are inconsistent in giving titles of books and names of ancient and contemporary authors. The current edition follows the modern practice of giving the names of authors in Roman letters, and book titles in italics. Exact quotations are referenced in the footnotes to the Latin text, and point to current scholarly editions. In almost all cases the references to church fathers and opponents could be traced either to critical editions or to seventeenth century publications

A comparison with the texts of the disputations in the *Opera omnia* of Walaeus and Rivetus shows that these texts simply copy the text from the

15 Rinse H. Reeling Brouwer, *Karl Barth and Post-Reformation Orthodoxy* (Farnham/Burlington: Ashgate, 2015), 75–106.

Synopsis. In two cases, however, a comparison with the *Opera omnia* of Walaeus was helpful, because the subjects of predestination and repentance are dealt with more extensively in his *Loci communes*, published in his *Opera*.[16]

Translation

The accompanying English translation intends to make the text of the *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* accessible to readers who have received little or no training in the Latin language, and also to convey the scholastic argument in the original text through a close rendering of the concepts, ideas, and modes of thought. The aim is to produce a translation that is as close to the original text as possible and as free as is necessary for a smooth reading in English. Whenever possible, we have sought to preserve the language, tone, and sentence structure employed by each of the four writers. At the same time, as it was also the intent of the writers, we have sought to preserve the sense of overall unity through the consistent rendering of recurring terms and modes of expression.

As the text of the *Synopsis* may not be immediately accessible to the present-day reader, the religious, cultural, and socio-political contexts in which it originated are reflected in numerous references and annotations.

The footnotes also provide the literary sources to which the authors of the *Synopsis* allude, and historical information about persons and events mentioned in the text. A very short biographical sketch is offered when persons are mentioned for the first time. Information on persons already mentioned in Volume 1 may be traced via the index of that volume.

The footnotes also explain the structure of complicated arguments, and give cross-references to other theses. Moreover, they define and explain concepts, distinctions, and specific arguments. Lastly, they analyze and interpret doctrinal positions, especially when these might be misunderstood in light of later discussions of them.

The Glossary contains a list of key terms and distinctions used in these disputations and is largely identical with the Glossary which was compiled for the first volume, although a few new terms have been added to it for this volume. In some cases all of the occurrences have been marked with an asterisk in both the Latin and the English text. In other cases, especially when the terms are used more often, not all of the occurrences have been marked; subsequent occurrences within the thesis have generally not been marked with an asterisk,

16 For the chapter "De Aeterna Praedestinatione" see Antonius Walaeus, *Opera omnia*, 2 vols. (Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643), 1:319–374 and for the chapter "De Resipiscentia" see *Opera* 1:431–444.

except when the term is translated or used in different ways. Since the Glossary is based on the Latin terms, the reader is enabled thus to compare the English rendering with the Latin original.

The current volume offers students of early Reformed Orthodoxy an annotated text of one of the influential surveys of Reformed soteriology in the *Synopsis* disputations ranging from the doctrines of grace to the calling and duties of the pastors. In sum, this volume traces biblical doctrines from predestination to preaching, and illustrates effectively the practical goal of theological reflection in the *Synopsis of a Purer Theology*.

Text and Translation

∴

DISPUTATIO XXIV

De Divina Praedestinatione[a]

Praeside D. ANTONIO WALAEO
Respondente ISAACO BISCOPIO

THESIS I Quamvis doctrina de aeterna Dei praedestinatione, sit ardua ac difficultatis plena; non ideo tamen de ea in Ecclesia Christi silendum, ut quidam praepostere cauti arbitrantur; quia Spiritu Sancto prudentiores esse nec possumus, nec velle debemus; qui eandem doctrinam, tam in prophetiis, quam concionibus, et epistolis ad totas Ecclesias scriptis, frequenter proponit; et quia materiam comprehendit plenam consolationis, et aliorum fructuum ad Ecclesiae aedificationem servientium, quemadmodum postea a nobis ostendetur.

II Agnoscimus tamen, cum omni moderatione ac prudentia spirituali de ea agendum, et hoc ante omnia sedulo curandum, ne ultra id quod scriptum est, hic sapiamus, sed solius verbi* divini ductum sequamur, in cujus obsequium veri Christi discipuli se libenter captivant, et *licet rationem* factorum Dei et profunditatem judiciorum ejus penetrare non possint, manifestissime tamen sciunt, et verum esse quod dicit, et justum esse quod facit*, ut Prosper *ad excerpta Genuens. resp*. 8. recte loquitur.[b]

[a] The *Opera omnia* of Walaeus contain an identical version of the "Disputatio de Divina Praedestinatione" included in his *Enchiridion Religionis Reformatae* (*Opera* 1:61–66). Walaeus's *Loci communes* contains a more elaborate discussion in the chapter "De Aeterna Praedestinatione" (*Opera* 1:319–374). [b] Prosper of Aquitaine, *Pro Augustino responsiones ad excerpta Genuensium* 8 (MPL 51:198).

DISPUTATION 24

On Divine Predestination

President: Antonius Walaeus
Respondent: Isaac Biscopius[1]

Although the doctrine of God's eternal predestination is a difficult one and full 1
of challenges, that is not a reason for us to be silent about it in the Church of Christ, as some backwardly cautious people think. For neither are we able to be more prudent than the Holy Spirit, nor should we wish to be. It is the Holy Spirit who sets forth this doctrine consistently, both in the prophecies and in the preaching, and also in the Epistles that were written to all the churches. And [we also should not be silent about it] because it contains material that is full of consolation and other fruits that serve the upbuilding of the Church, as we shall later demonstrate.

We do grant, however, that we should treat it with all spiritual modesty and 2
prudence and that we should be careful above all else that our own knowledge in this matter does not go beyond what is written;[2] but we should follow the lead only of God's Word.* True disciples of Christ willingly make themselves captives in order to obey it, and "although they cannot possibly fathom the reason* for God's acts and the depth of his judgments, they know perfectly well that what He says is true and that what He does is just," as Prosper correctly states in his *Defense of Augustine against Select Passages of the Genovese Priests*, response 8.[3]

---

1 Isaac Biscopius or Isaacus Episcopius was born in Middelburg in 1599 and matriculated in Leiden in the liberal arts on 23 February 1619. He defended this disputation in 1622. He was ordained in Zoutelande (province of Zeeland) in 1627 and Vlissingen in 1627; he died in 1661. See Willem N. du Rieu, ed., *Album studiosorum academia Lugduno-Batavae mdlxxv–mdccclxxv* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1875), 140, and Fred A. van Lieburg, *Repertorium van Nederlandse hervormde predikanten tot 1816* (Dordrecht: Van Lieburg, 1996), 23 and "Isaak Biscop," in Godewardus Vrolikhert, *Vlissingsche Kerkhemel ofte Levensbeschryving van alle de hervormde leeraren, die, sedert den afval van Spanjen 1572, totop dezen tyd, in de Nederduytsche kerke van Vlissingen gearbeydt hebben* (Vlissingen: Pieter de Paaynaar, 1758), 112–117.

2 The phrasing alludes to Romans 12:3 and 1 Corinthians 4:6.

3 Prosper of Aquitaine (c. 390–c. 455) was a layman well versed in the religious controversies of his day. He defended Augustine in his doctrine of grace, free will, and predestination, and attacked (semi-)Pelagianism. By informing Augustine of Pelagian comments on his *De correptione et gratia* he incited Augustine to write his *De praedestinatione sanctorum* and *De dono perseverantiae* (429–430). After Augustine died in 430, Prosper continued to disseminate

III Praedestinare ergo (ut a voce* ordiamur) graece προορίζειν, id est, praefinire, duo omnino significatu suo comprehendit; primo certi aliquid de re* aliqua agenda apud mentem suam constituere; deinde eandem rem ad certum eventum ac finem* destinare. Unde et Augustinus lib. 2. *De bono persev*. cap. 17.[a] *In sua quae falli mutarique non potest praescientia,* opera sua futura disponere, id omnino neque aliud quicquam est praedestinare*. Et Fulgentius *Ad Monimum* lib. 1.[b] *Praedestinatio nihil est aliud, quam praeparatio operum Dei, qui in aeterna sua dispositione, aut misericorditer se facturum praevidit, aut juste*.

IV Sumitur autem haec praedestinationis vox, vel generalius de actionibus divinae providentiae, tam in bono quam in malo, ut videre est, Act. 4, 28. et 1 Cor. 2, 7. vel de ordinatione personarum* ad certum et supernaturalem* finem.*

V Posteriori modo* (sicuti et nos hic sumimus) intellecta vox,* in Sacra Scriptura Novi Testamenti, non nisi de gratuito electionis decreto usurpatur, quia totum hoc quantumcumque est, sive media sive finem spectemus, a solius Dei misericordi dispositione atque efficacia pendet.

VI Fatemur interim, ex communi usu Augustini et aliorum veterum scriptorum, atque analogia loci Act. 4, 28. nomen* praedestinationis tam de reprobatione quam de electione recte usurpari; non tamen tamquam genus* per omnia synonymum, sed analogum* tantum, quia licet ipse reprobationis actus* sit a Deo, tamen omnia circa quae reprobatio versatur, ex reprobatione non sunt, ut in sequentibus clarius videbitur.

VII Haec divina praedestinatio etiam Angelos respicit, quorum aliqui *electi* vocantur, 1 Tim. 5, 21. reliqui vero *aeternis vinculis ad judicium magni diei sub caligine* dicuntur *servari*, Jud. v. 6. Nos vero de hominum praedestinatione

---

[a] Augustine, *De dono perseverantiae* 17.41 (MPL 45:1019). Augustine's *On the Predestination of the Saints* consists of two parts. In the sixth century the name *On the Gift of Perseverance* (*De dono perseverantiae*) was given to the second part. Some manuscripts have the title *On the Good of Perseverance* (*De bono perseverantiae*). This title was used in some printed editions in the sixteenth century. Here and in thesis 59 Walaeus uses *De bono perseverantiae*. [b] Fulgentius, *Ad Monimum* 2.1 (CCSL 91:33).

---

his teachings and did his utmost to make them accepted. Prosper's chief work was *De gratia Dei et libero arbitrio* (432). He also composed a collection of Augustinian propositions called *Liber sententiarum Sancti Augustini*, which played an important role in the refutation of semi-Pelagianism by the Second Council of Orange in 529. The work referred to is Prosper's reply to two priests in Genoa to clarify certain passages of Augustine's *De praedestinatione sanctorum* and *De dono perseverantiae*. See also note 47 below on Rufinus.

And so, to begin with the word* 'to predestine' (in Greek: *prohorizein*), that 3
is, 'to determine beforehand,' its meaning generally entails these two elements: first, it means to decide something specific in one's mind about a thing* that should be done. Secondly, it means to appoint that thing for a specific outcome and end.* Hence Augustine, in his *The Good of Perseverance*, 2,17, says: "To arrange his future works in his foreknowledge* which cannot fail or be changed, that—and nothing else—certainly is to predestine." And Fulgentius, in *To Monimus*, book 1,[4] says: "Predestination is nothing other than the preparation of the works of God, who in his eternal arrangement has foreseen that He will act either in mercy or justice."

This word 'predestination' is taken either in a more general sense as referring 4
to the deeds of divine providence (both in good and in bad things, as can be seen in Acts 4:28 and 1Corinthians 2:7), or as referring to the ordination of persons* for a specific supernatural* goal.*

Taken in the latter sense* (as we also do here), in Holy Scripture of the New 5
Testament it is used exclusively as referring to the free decree of election, for this entire decree as great as it is (whether we are considering its means or its goal) depends on the merciful arrangement and efficacy of God alone.

At the same time we confess that, according to its common usage by Augus- 6
tine and other ancient writers and according to Acts 4:28, the word* 'predestination' is used correctly to refer to both reprobation and election, not as indicating categories* that are synonymous in every respect, but only as analogous.*[5] For although the act* of reprobation itself comes from God, yet not everything pertaining to reprobation stems from reprobation, as we shall see more clearly in what follows.[6]

This divine predestination pertains also to angels, some of whom are called 7
elect (1Timothy 5:21) while it says that others are "to be kept in darkness, bound with everlasting chains for judgment on the great day" (Jude 6). However, here

---

4 Fulgentius of Ruspe (462/467–527/533) wrote *Ad Monimum* to defend the Augustinian double predestination against the criticism of the semi-Pelagians of Gaul, insisting that Augustine had meant that God predestined the wicked to a just punishment (*ad poenam*), not to sin or to fault (*ad culpam*).

5 According to Walaeus both reprobation and election belong to the *genus* of predestination, but they differ in character. Some Scholastics distinguish between a *genus univocum*, here called *genus synonymum*, the strict meaning of the word, and a *genus analogum* which has a much broader sense. By this distinction Walaeus stresses that election and reprobation are dissimilar.

6 See the distinction between negative reprobation and affirmative reprobation in theses 49–51 below. Walaeus especially denies that God is the author of sin; the sin of the reprobate is *circa reprobationem* but not *ex reprobatione*. See thesis 21 below.

hic tantum agemus, quia haec Ecclesiam Christi peculiariter spectat, et Sacra Scriptura de illa frequentius ac copiosius agit.

VIII Ut autem tota haec doctrina, quantum sufficere judicamus, a nobis pertractetur, primo electionis materia, deinde et reprobationis negotium a nobis ordine explicabitur.

DE ELECTIONE

IX Electio Graece ἐκλογὴ ex vocis* nativa proprietate et communi usu, selectionem aliquorum prae aliis et ex aliis notat; unde et electi dicuntur qui ad munus aliquod Politicum aut Ecclesiasticum selecti sunt, 1 Sam. 10, 24. Luc. 6, 13. item populus aliquis in externam Ecclesiam a Deo prae aliis segregatus, ut Deut. 4, 37. 1 Cor. 1, 27. Ergo et illa electio, qua alii prae aliis ad aeternam salutem electi dicuntur, non aliter intelligenda est. Quemadmodum Christus testatur, Mat. 20, 16. *Multi vocati, sed pauci electi*, et Apostolus Rom. 11,7. *Electi assecuti sunt, reliqui occalluerunt*, nec sine ejusmodi ad alios respectu electionis vox in Sacra Scriptura usurpatur.

X Haec electio ad salutem duobus modis* consideratur; primo, prout ab aeterno facta est in Dei eligentis decreto, deinde prout in tempore electi Dei, reipsa e mundo evocantur atque eximuntur, et Christo per fidem inseruntur; de qua Christus loquitur, Joh. 15, 19. *Vos e mundo non estis, sed ego vos elegi ex mundo*, quam utramque Augustinus eleganter conjungit, *De Praedestin. sanct. cap. 17*,[a] cum inquit: *electi sumus ante mundi constitutionem, ea praedestinatione, qua Deus sua futura facta praevidit; de mundo autem electi sumus, ea vocatione, qua Deus id quod praedestinavit, implevit.*

XI Licet autem utraque haec electio ex eodem fonte nascatur, et posterior sit proprius prioris effectus, de prima tamen haec nostra disputatio peculiariter

[a] Augustine, *De praedestinatione sanctorum* 17 (MPL 44:986).

we shall deal only with the predestination of human beings, since this concerns the Church of Christ in particular, and because Holy Scripture deals with it more frequently and fully.

So that we may discuss this whole doctrine to a point we deem sufficient, 8
we shall—in due order—explain first the matter of election, and then also the difficult question of reprobation.

On Election

Taken in its original sense and by its common usage, the word* 'election' 9
(in Greek, *eklogē*) denotes choosing some people above others and out of others. Hence, they are also called elect who have been chosen for a certain political or ecclesiastical office (1Samuel 10:24, Luke 6:13); it also denotes a certain people separated above other nations by God into the outward Church (Deuteronomy 4:37, 1Corinthians 1:27). Therefore, also that election whereby some, above others, are said to have been chosen unto eternal salvation, should not be understood in some other way, as Christ himself testifies in Mat. 20,16: "Many are called but few are chosen."[7] Likewise, the apostle says in Romans 11:7: "The elect obtained it, but the rest were hardened." In Holy Scripture, the word 'election' is used only in such a relation to others.[8]

This election unto salvation is considered in two ways:* first, insofar as it 10
has been established from eternity in the decree of God who elects; secondly, insofar as, in time, the elect of God are actually called forth and taken from the world and engrafted into Christ through faith.[9] About the latter Christ says in John 15:19: "You are not of the world but I have chosen you out of the world." Augustine elegantly combines those two elections in his *On the Predestination of the Saints*, chapter 17, by saying: "We have been chosen before the creation of the world by that predestination whereby God has foreseen his future acts; however we are chosen out of the world by that calling whereby God has fulfilled what he has predestined."

Although these two elections originate from the same source and the latter 11
is properly an effect of the former, this disputation of ours provides instruction

---

7 The text was included in Mat. 20,16 in the *textus receptus*, but does not occur there in modern translations.

8 Election always implies the non-election of others; see also thesis 47 below.

9 The distinction between God's decree and its execution provides the basic structural framework for Walaeus's discussion of election. In what follows he focuses on the eternal decree of election. Theodore Beza saw that confusion of this distinction was a cause of great error. See D.W. Sinnema, "The Issue of Reprobation at the Synod of Dort (1618–19) in Light of the History of this Doctrine" (Ph.D. dissertation, Toronto School of Theology, 1985), 67–68, 85–86.

instituitur; ac proinde ipsius naturam,* circumstantias, causas* atque usus in sequentibus sigillatim exponemus.

XII Ad naturae* ejus intelligentiam voces aliquae, quae συνωνύμως a Scriptura nonnunquam usurpantur, breviter indicandae sunt; quarum prima est vox* προγνώσεως, *praecognitionis*, qua utitur Apostolus Rom. 8, 29. et 1Pet. 1, 2. et supremum in hac electionis scala gradum semper obtinet. Ea autem non pro notitia* simplici, qua etiam rejectos novit, sed pro notitia* approbativa ac sapientissimo Dei consilio, quo eos pro suis agnoscit, sumitur. Quemadmodum Joh. 10, 14. Christus de ovibus suis inquit, *ego cognosco oves meas, et cognoscor a meis*. Altera vox προορισμοῦ, *i. praedestinationis*, qua utitur Apostolus Rom. 8, 30. et Eph. 1, 4. etc. ipsam determinationem tum mediorum tum finis,* in eisdem personis* jam praecognitis denotat. Quemadmodum liquet ex Rom. 8, 30. *quos vero praenovit, illos et praedestinavit conformandos imagini Filii sui, etc*. Denique vox προθέσεως, *propositi*, in hac materia frequenter usurpata, firmitatem immutabilem* divini hujus consilii indicat, et simul gratuitum fontem unde id consilium fluit. Quemadmodum ex duorum locorum collatione liquet, nempe Rom. 9, 11. *Ut propositum Dei, quod est secundum electionem, maneret, non ex operibus, sed ex vocante;* item 2Tim. 1, 9. *Servavit et vocavit nos vocatione*

especially concerning the first. Accordingly, in what follows we shall explain, one by one, its nature,* its circumstances, its causes* and its advantages.[10]

For an understanding of its nature* we must briefly point out several words 12
that Scripture sometimes uses synonymously. The first of these is the term* *prognōsis*, 'foreknowledge,' which the apostles use in Romans 8:29 and 1 Peter 1:2. It always occupies the top-most step on this ladder of election. This term is not used in the sense of God's simple knowledge* by which He also knows the rejected, but in the sense of his approving knowledge* and most wise counsel by which He knows those who are his.[11] In this manner Christ says about his sheep: "I know my sheep and they know me" (John 10:14). A second term is *prohorismos*, 'predestination,' which the apostle uses in Romans 8:30 and Ephesians 1:4, etc. It denotes the actual determination of both the means and the goal,* in those persons* who already are foreknown. This is clear from Romans 8:29: "Those whom he foreknew he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son," etc. Then there is the word *prothesis*, 'purpose,' which is used frequently in this subject-matter; it indicates the firm immutability* of this divine counsel and, at the same time, it points to the source of free grace from which this counsel flows. This becomes clear from the combination of two texts, first Romans 9:11: "In order that God's purpose according to election might continue, not because of works but because of Him who calls." And, secondly: "He saved us and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works but

10 The nature of election is discussed in theses 12–14, its circumstances in theses 15–20, its causes in theses 21–40, and its advantages in theses 41–43 below.

11 The 'approving knowledge' (*notitia approbativa*) includes God's knowledge of the elect, for election belongs to the good reality, constituted by the good God. The distinction with God's 'simple knowledge' (*notitia simplex*) runs parallel to the distinction between election and rejection. The concept of 'approving knowledge' originated in the thirteenth century Franciscan tradition. The *Summa Minorum* developed a threefold distinction concerning the knowledge of God: approving knowledge (*scientia approbationis*), simple knowledge (*simplex notitia*) and simple knowledge as such or in an absolute sense (*simplex notitia absolute*). The good God knows what is good in reality (*scientia approbationis*), but God also knows the whole of reality (*simplex notitia*); and again, he knows all that is possible and does not really happen (*simplex notitia absolute*). For Walaeus, however, *notitia simplex* does not have the meaning of *notitia simplex absolute*; he places *notitia simplex* over against *notitia approbativa* that involves not only his knowledge but also his will and was considered to be the cause of what is known. God also knows all other things, including what is not good, and this is what Walaeus calls his *notitia simplex*. The point of the distinction is to be able to express the difference between the way God relates to the good objects—here, the elect—and bad objects of his foreknowledge, since by his omniscience he does know all things in some way. Cf. *PRRD* 3:410 for a concise treatment of the approving knowledge.

sancta, non secundum opera nostra, sed secundum propositum proprium, et gratiam quae data est nobis in Christo Jesu ante tempora secularia.

XIII Ut vero hujus decreti ac divini consilii natura* plenius explicetur, definitionem ejus pleniorem proponemus, et ejus praecipua membra deinceps examinabimus.

XIV Definimus ergo electionem illam aeternum atque immutabile* Dei decretum, quo ex universo genere humano, e primaeva integritate in peccatum et exitium sua culpa prolapso, certam hominum singularium multitudinem, ceteris nec meliorum nec digniorum, ex solo beneplacito suo, ad salutem in Christo Jesu elegit; eosdemque Filio suo dare redimendos, et peculiari atque efficaci operandi modo* ad fidem vivam in ipsum, et in eadem viva fide perseverantiam certam, perducere constituit, idque ad demonstrationem gratuitae suae misericordiae, et laudem gloriosae suae gratiae.*

XV Decretum hoc esse *aeternum*, demonstratur,* quia regnum quod benedicti illi Patris possidebunt, a fundatione mundi iis fuit paratum, Matt. 25, 34. et omnium clarissime ad Eph. 1, 4. *Elegit nos in ipso ante jacta mundi fundamenta, ut essemus sancti et inculpati coram eo in caritate.*

XVI *Immutabilitas** ejusdem decreti ex ipsa Dei natura* satis evincitur. Qui enim consilium suum mutat, vel propter defectum sapientiae in deliberando, vel propter defectum potentiae* in exsequendo, id mutare solet; quorum neutrum Deo sine blasphemia attribui potest, unde et David Psal. 33, 11. exclamat, *Consilium Jehovae in seculum consistet, cogitationes ejus in aetatem et aetatem.*

XVII A veritate igitur omnino aliena est illa quorundam divisio, qua electionem distinguunt in completam et incompletam, revocabilem et irrevocabilem. Quia

according to his own purpose, and grace, which is given to us in Christ Jesus before the world began" (2 Timothy 1:9).

In order to explain the nature* of this decree and divine counsel more fully, 13
we shall present a fuller definition of it and, after that, examine the most important components of it.

And so we define election as the eternal and immutable* decree of God 14
whereby He chooses from the whole human race that had fallen by its own fault from pristine integrity into sin and destruction a specific number of individual people (neither better nor more worthy than others) solely out of his own good pleasure, unto salvation in Christ Jesus. He decided to give them to his Son in order to redeem them and lead them by a special and efficacious way* of working to a living faith in him and to a sure perseverance in that same living faith. He did so in order to demonstrate his gracious mercy, and, to the praise of his glorious grace.*[12]

That this decree is eternal is shown* in that the kingdom which will be 15
possessed by those who are blessed of the Father has been prepared for them from the foundation of the world (Matthew 25:34). This appears most clearly in the Epistle to the Ephesians 1:4: "He has chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and blameless before him in love."

The immutability* of this decree is sufficiently shown by the very nature* 16
of God. Someone who changes his plan usually changes it either for a lack of wisdom when he was considering it, or because of a failure of power* in carrying it out—neither of these defects can be attributed to God without blasphemy. Hence David exclaims: "The counsel of Jehovah stands firm for ever, his thoughts to all generations" (Psalm 33:11).

Therefore the distinction that some people make between a complete and 17
an incomplete election, and between a revocable and an irrevocable one,[13] is

12 The phrasing closely follows the definition of election of the *Canons of Dort*, I, 7. The terms 'eternal' and 'immutable' do not imply that election is absolutely necessary; it remains contingent upon the sovereign will of God.

13 In the wake of the Synod of Dort, Walaeus is no doubt thinking of the four-decree structure of predestination as expounded by Jacobus Arminius in his *Verklaringhe* (Leiden, 1610) in which a fourfold order of the divine decrees is expressed: 1) an absolute decree to save sinful man in Jesus Christ; 2) an absolute decree to save those who believe in Jesus Christ; 3) the decree to administer the means necessary for faith; 4) the decree to save and damn particular persons which is founded on God's foreknowledge whereby He knew who would, by grace, believe and persevere, and also who would not believe and persevere. Each of the decrees—of which the first three are universal and unconditional, while the fourth is particular and conditional—is only a part of the complete election or predestination and so is incomplete and revocable unless and until the condition of the

Sacra Scriptura unam tantum electionem aeternam novit, quae cum certo et infallibili eventu semper est conjuncta; quemadmodum locus Mat. 24, 24. evincit, *Si fieri posset, seducerentur electi*, et 22. *Propter electos decurtabuntur dies;* item scala Apostoli Pauli Rom. 8, 29. *Quos praenovit, eos praedestinavit, etc. eosdemque vocavit, justificavit ac glorificavit*, et asseveratio ejusdem Apostoli Rom. 11, 2. *Non abjecit Deus populum suum, quem praenovit*, item vers. 7. *Electi assecuti sunt, reliqui occalluerunt*, et similia plurima.

XVIII Etsi vero libenter concedamus, electionem ad salutem, et salutis media, distincte posse* considerari, sicuti Scriptura quoque nonnunquam distincte proponit, negamus tamen, propterea hos actus* in Dei decreto revera esse diversos, quia unico et simplici actu haec omnia determinavit,* quemadmodum unico et simplici actu omnia ab aeterno cognovit; sed haec tantum nostro considerandi modo dicuntur, propter multitudinem objectorum, quae hoc uno eligendi actu comprehenduntur; inter quae objecta ordinem aliquem in aeternitate dandum esse agnoscimus. Quemadmodum qui multas res* simul videt, uno quidem obtuitu omnes videt, inter res visas tamen ordo aliquis constitui potest et solet.

XIX Quum ergo nobis objicitur, supervacuam esse mediorum ordinationem, quando electi jam actu* aliquo antecedente ad salutem absolute* sunt destinati, id ex Orthodoxae sententiae mera ignorantia oritur, quia Deus nunquam quemquam absolute ad salutem elegit, si τὸ *absolute* excludat media, quae Deus ad salutis consecutionem ordinavit; sed ordinatio illa ad salutem in Dei proposito, considerationem mediorum, quae ad salutem necessaria sunt, ab aeterno, in eodem illo actu semper habuit conjunctam. Unde et Paulus 2 Thess. 2, 13. inquit, *Deus nos elegit ab initio ad salutem in sanctificatione Spiritus et fide*

---

fourth decree is fulfilled and completes election. Gerrit J. Hoenderdaal (ed.), *Verklaring van Jacobus Arminius afgelegd in de vergadering van de Staten van Holland op 30 Oktober 1608* (Lochem: De Tijdstroom, 1960), 104–106; cf. William den Boer, *God's Twofold Love. The Theology of Jacob Arminius (1559–1609)* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010), 148–150.

utterly foreign to the truth. For Holy Scripture knows only one eternal election. It is always connected with a certain and infallible outcome, as is proven by Matthew 24:24: "If it were possible, that the elect would be led astray" and [verse] 22: "For the sake of the elect those days will be shortened." Consider also the 'ladder' of the apostle Paul in Romans 8:29: "For those whom He foreknew he also predestined etc." and "He called and justified and glorified them." And see also the affirmation of the same point by the apostle in Romans 11:2: "God has not rejected his people whom he foreknew," and verse 7: "The elect obtained it, but the rest were hardened," and many similar texts.

Although we willingly admit that the election unto salvation and the means 18
of salvation can* be considered separately, just as Scripture sometimes also presents them separately, yet we do deny that for this reason these acts* are truly separate in God's decree. For He has determined* all these things by one simple act, in the same way as He has known all things from eternity by one single act. But these things are said thus according to our way of thinking, because of the multitude of objects that this one act of electing includes, and we acknowledge that a certain order must have been assigned to these objects in eternity.[14] It can be compared with someone who sees many things* at once—sees them all at a glance—even though some order can* and usually is arranged for those many things.

Hence, when the objection is raised that an orderly ranking of means is 19
superfluous since the elect already are absolutely* destined to salvation by a certain preceding act,*[15] this objection arises from a complete lack of understanding the orthodox point of view: God never elects someone unto salvation absolutely, if 'absolutely' excludes the means which God has appointed to attain that salvation. But such appointment to salvation in God's plan occurs from eternity, and in that same act it is always connected to a consideration of the means that are necessary for salvation. Therefore Paul says in 2 Thessalonians 2:13: "God chose us from the beginning to be saved through the sanctification of the Spirit and faith in the truth," and Peter writes "to those who have been elected according to the foreknowledge of God the Father and through the

14 Walaeus keeps election and the means together in one act of God; the distinction between them is conceptual. See *SPT* 6.21, 25.

15 This is an Arminian objection: if election is absolute, it therefore excludes means. Walaeus responds that absolute does not mean free from means or goal, but free from a motivating cause outside God. In the case of election the word *absolute* (from *absolvo*: to set free) means that God elects people without regard to anything positive or negative in them as a reason to elect them, but not free from the need of faith and repentance for its execution. See also theses 58–60 below concerning absolute reprobation.

veritatis, et Petrus 1. Epist. cap. 1, 1. et 2. *Electis secundum praecognitionem Dei Patris, in sanctificatione Spiritus, ad obedientiam et aspersionem sanguinis Christi*.

XX Quod vero homo, cum finem* certum sibi jam proposuit, tum demum de mediis consultat, aut priusquam inter multa media unum prae aliis eligat, deliberationem interponit, id ex imperfectione intellectus ejus oritur, qui non nisi successive haec cogitare atque seligere potest.* In infinito* vero actu divinae sapientiae ejusmodi successiva actio locum non habet, sed sicuti tam finis* optimus, quam media ad eum consequendum aptissima, simplici intelligentiae Dei, etiam ante omne decretum, simul ab aeterno fuerunt praesentia, ita quoque sapientia et voluntas* divina finem hunc et media, misericordiae ac justitiae suae convenientissima, in eadem aeternitate, sine ulla deliberatione aut consultatione, simul selegit atque ordinavit.

XXI *Materia* ex qua Deus quosdam gratiose elegit, est *genus* humanum e primaeva integritate in peccatum sua culpa prolapsum*, ac proinde *et coram eo condemnationis reum*. Nam Deus non instituit hanc electionem ex alio hominum genere, quam quale erat propagandum. Jam vero Scriptura testatur *totum*

sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ" (1 Peter 1:1–2).

When a human being already has proposed for himself a certain goal* and 20
thereupon thinks about the means, or when he chooses beforehand one of many means above others, it implies deliberation on his part. This happens because his intellect is imperfect. For his intellect can* only contemplate and choose these things in a successive order. But in the infinite* act of divine wisdom there is no place for such a successive act. But just as both the best goal* and the most appropriate means to achieve it have, from eternity, been present simultaneously to God's mere understanding,[16] also before any decree, so also the divine wisdom and will* simultaneously have chosen and ordained this goal and the means that are best suited to his mercy and justice, within that same eternity, without any deliberative or consultative process.

The material from which God in his grace has chosen some people is the 21
human race,* fallen from its original integrity into sin by its own fault, and so liable to condemnation before him. For God established this election from no other human race than the one that would multiply in that state.[17] In 1 John

16 The term *intelligentia simplex* is used for God's knowledge, logically 'before any decree.' It seems to differ from the *notitia simplex* in thesis 12 above, that was used to explain the way in which God knows the reprobate and to stand close to the concept of *simplex notitia absolute*; see note 11 above. It probably runs parallel to what Walaeus in his *Loci* calls God's *scientia simplicis intelligentiae* or *simplex intellectus*, the knowledge of God that precedes His decree and differs from His *scientia visionis*; see Walaeus, *Opera* 1: 114–558, 174–175. There he even allows a *scientia media* or *scientia hypothetica*, although he explains it in a restricted way. For a discussion of this Reformed interpretation of the *scientia media* see *PRRD* 3:420. It might be on purpose that Walaeus is a more reticent here than in the *Loci* originating from before the Synod of Dort, because of the joint responsibility with the other Leiden professors for the *Synopsis* and because of the Arminian use of the concept of *scientia media*. Gisbertus Voetius discusses Walaeus's position in detail without mentioning his name. He rejected the concept, as Walaeus used it, altogether; see Beck, *Gisbertus Voetius*, 287–291. For the related though slightly different distinction between theoretical knowledge and practical knowledge see the Glossary on *notitia theoretica* and cf. *SPT* 11.2 and 14.22.

17 Walaeus addresses the debates on the logical order of the divine decrees and the object of predestination. The supralapsarians locate the decree concerning election logically 'before' or 'above' the decree concerning the fall; the object of the decree concerns human beings who are not yet created or fallen. Walaeus maintains the infralapsarian position which holds that God in electing people views them as created and in the state of sin; the decree concerning election must be located 'after' or 'below' the decree concerning the fall. At the Synod of Dort, Walaeus had joined his future colleagues Polyander and Thysius in defending infralapsarianism against Franciscus Gomarus, the lone proponent of the

mundum jacere in malo, 1Joh. 5, 19. item *Judaeos et Graecos omnes esse sub peccato, ac non esse justum ne unum quidem*, Rom. 3, 9. et 19. *omne os esse obturatum et totum mundum esse* ὑπόδικον τῷ Θεῷ, divinae *condemnationi obnoxium*; unde evidenter consequitur, ex eodem hominum genere Deum suos ab aeterno eligere statuisse.

XXII Demonstrant* illud etiam omnes fere loci qui de aeterna hac electione agunt. *Electi enim sumus in Christo, ut essemus sancti*, Eph. 1, 4. *et praedestinati in adoptionem filiorum*, vers 5. ergo antea eramus extra Christum, injusti, et ab adoptione filiorum alieni. *Electi sumus ad salutem in sanctificatione Spiritus et fide veritatis*, 2 Thess. 2, 13. ergo sanctificatione Spiritus et fide veritatis destituti. *Quos praecognovit, eos imagini Christi conformandos praedestinavit*, imago ergo Dei in iis non erat. Rom. 8, 29. electi sunt *vasa misericordiae*, quemadmodum reprobi *vasa irae*, Rom. 9. Deus autem proprie* miseretur miserorum, quemadmodum non nisi in peccatores iram aut odium demonstrat, Rom. 1, 18. ut jam omittamus, quod Sacra Scriptura ab electione ad redemptionem aut vocationem nostri semper transitum facit; nunquam vero ad creationem ad imaginem Dei, aut lapsum ac peccati permissionem atque ordinationem, ut qui altius ascendunt, coguntur statuere.

XXIII Interim fatemur, nec hominem ambiguo fine* fuisse creatum, nec lapsum hominum sine speciali Dei providentia accidisse, nam si ne passer quidem cadat in terram sine Patre nostro, multo minus totum genus* humanum, *sed Deus voluit primo ostendere, quid in homine possit liberum arbitrium,* deinde vero quid possit suae gratiae beneficium*.[a] Infinito* igitur scientiae* suae lumine Deus praevidens fore, ut homo ad imaginem suam conditus libero arbitrio cum tota posteritate abuteretur, quo justitiae et misericordiae admirandae via

[a] Augustine, *De correptione et gratia* 10.27 (CSEL 92:251).

supralapsarian position at the synod; see Sinnema, Moser, and Selderhuis, *Acta of the Synod of Dordt*, 1:134. cf. Jan Daniël de Lind van Wijngaarden, *Antonius Walaeus* (Leiden: Los, 1891), 107. The Synod of Dort did not reject the supralapsarian view, but preferred the infralapsarian view as more certain and more in agreement with the Word of God; see Walaeus, *Opera* 1:327. Some delegates harbored a certain sense of unease toward the supralapsarian view. On this see Nicolas Fornerod, *Registres de la Compagnie des pasteurs de Genève*, volume 14 (1618–1619), Travaux d'humanisme et renaissance 511 (Geneva: Droz, 2012), *passim*, and especially xliv–xlvii, 312–312, note 663, 320, and 321, note 704.

5:19 Scripture indeed bears witness that "the whole world is subject to evil" and, in Romans 3:9[–10] that "all men, both Jews and Greeks, are under the power of sin and none is righteous, no, not one." And in verse 19: "Every mouth will be stopped and the whole world held accountable to condemnation by God" (*hupodikon tōi theōi*). The conclusion from this is obvious: it is from this same human race that God has decided to choose his people from eternity.

22 And also, nearly all the texts that deal with this eternal election prove* the point. "For we have been chosen in Christ that we should be holy" (Ephesians 1:4) and "He predestined us for adoption as children" (verse 5). Therefore, previously we were outside Christ, and unrighteous, and not fit for adoption as children. "We were chosen to salvation through the sanctification of the Spirit and in belief in the truth" (2 Thessalonians 2:13). Therefore, previously, we were devoid of the sanctification of the Spirit and belief in the truth. "Those whom He foreknew He predestined, to be conformed to the image of Christ" and therefore the image of God was not in them (Romans 8:29). The elect are "vessels of mercy," just as the reprobate are "vessels of wrath" (Romans 9[:21–22]). In a proper* sense, God is merciful to the miserable, just as He demonstrates his wrath and hate only towards sinners (Romans 1:18), not to mention the fact that Holy Scripture always passes from election to redemption or calling but never from election to creation in the image of God or to the fall and permission and ordering of sin,[18] as those who 'ascend higher' are forced to state.[19]

23 At the same time we confess that man had been created not with a changeable goal,* and also that the fall of man did not occur without God's special providence. For if not even a sparrow falls to the ground without our Father, how much less the whole human race.* "But, first of all, it was God's will to demonstrate what a human being's free choice* was able to achieve, and, next, what the benefit of his grace could do." Since God, in the infinite* light of his wisdom,* foresaw that man, created after his image, was going to abuse his free choice, together with his entire posterity, whereby the way would be revealed

18 On God's permission of evil see *SPT* 11.22–23.

19 Those who 'ascend higher' are the supralapsarians. Arminius had devoted much effort to refuting the supralapsarian position of some orthodox theologians (e.g., Beza, William Perkins, and Gomarus): to his mind it implied that God created man and ordained the fall as means to execute the decree of predestination, thereby turning him into the author of sin. See Sinnema, "Issue of Reprobation," 145. In arguing that Scripture supports the infralapsarian order from election to redemption, Walaeus renders this Arminian argument harmless.

manifestior aperiretur, *putavit ad omnipotentissimam suam bonitatem potius pertinere, de malo benefacere, quam malum esse non sinere*, ut recte Augustinus monet.[a]

XXIV In hoc electionis decreto, cum tota vetustate et nonnullis reformatae Ecclesiae magnis auctoribus primum locum Christo tamquam capiti atque redemptori Ecclesiae assignamus, quemadmodum Esaiae 42, 1. idcirco *electus ille Dei servus appellatur, quem benigne accipit anima ejus, seu puer ille in quo animae ejus complacuit*, ut Matt. 12, 18. hunc locum citat, et 1 Pet. 1, 20. dicitur *agnus praecognitus ante jacta mundi fundamenta*.

XXV Neque cum hoc pugnat quod Christus Ecclesiae redimendae causa* sit electus, nam etsi agnoscamus, Deum Patrem, *ex quo sunt omnia et qui nos sibi reconciliavit per Christum*, 2 Cor. 5, 18. voluntatem* seu affectum* habuisse quorundam miserendi, quum Christum in eadem aeternitate redemptorem constituerit, quia redemptor sine redimendis cogitari non potest; tamen haec voluntas aut affectus solus in Scripturis electio nondum vocatur, quia misericordia illa a justitia impediebatur, quominus peccatoribus actu* completo salutem destinaret, nisi satisfactione interveniente: et quia electio haec non tantum finem,* sed et media ad salutem necessaria complectitur, ut Thesi 19. est ostensum.

XXVI Sed tum demum electio vocatur et est, cum Christus eligendorum caput et mediator est constitutus, et ipsi in illius membra sunt destinati; atque hoc respectu *in Christo Jesu electi* dicimur Eph. 1, 4. et *per ipsum in adoptionem filiorum praeordinati*, vers. 5. et *praedestinati ut ejus imagini conformaremur, quod*[b] *ipse esset primogenitus inter multos fratres*, Rom. 8, 29.

---

[a] Augustine, *De correptione et gratia* 10.27 (CSEL 92:251). [b] quo: Walaeus, *Opera* 1:63.

to the admiration of his justice and mercy, "He deemed it to be more fitting to his most almighty goodness to do well out of evil than not to permit evil to exist," as Augustine rightly observes.

24 Together with all the ancient authors and many great authors of the Reformed Church, in this decree of election we assign the foremost place to Christ as Head and Redeemer of the Church,[20] just as He is called the "chosen servant of God whom his soul willingly accepts" or that "servant in whom his soul delights" (Isaiah 42:1, as quoted by Matthew 12:18), and who in 1 Peter 1:20 is called "the lamb, known before the foundation of the world."

25 The fact that Christ was chosen for the purpose* of redeeming the Church does not conflict with this.[21] For even if we admit that God the Father—"from whom are all things, and who has reconciled us with himself through Christ" (2 Corinthians 5:18)—had the will* or the disposition* to bestow mercy upon some people as from that same time eternal He established Christ as Redeemer (and one cannot think of a redeemer apart from the persons who are going to be redeemed), nevertheless, the Scriptures do not call this will or disposition by itself 'election,'[22] because this mercy was hindered by justice from destining salvation for sinners by a complete act* unless satisfaction intervened, and because election not only includes the goal* but also the means necessary for salvation, just as we have demonstrated in thesis 19.

26 But it goes by the name of election—and indeed *is* election—only then when Christ has been established as the Head and Mediator of those who are going to be elected, and when they themselves have been destined as his members. And in this respect we are called "the elect in Jesus Christ" (Ephesians 1:4) and "those who have been predestined by Him unto adoption as his children" (verse 5); and "we were predestined to be conformed to his image so that He might be the First-born among many brothers" (Romans 8:29).

---

20 In the *Loci* Walaeus mentions Augustine, Girolamo Zanchi and Amandus Polanus among those who hold that Christ is the first among the elect; see Walaeus, *Opera* 1:330.

21 This thesis intends to answer the Arminian question how Christ at the same time can be part of the decree that rests in the good pleasure of God and be the elect Redeemer of the church. The Arminians held that, instead of God's mere good pleasure, Christ's foreseen merit was the cause of election. Walaeus does not deny that Christ was chosen to redeem his church, but this is not properly the cause of election although election is inseparably related to the redeeming merit of Christ as he concludes in thesis 29 below.

22 Some Arminians held that 'election' was the intention of God to save. According to Walaeus's *Loci*, the divine *affectus* or disposition to elect or the intention to save some people cannot properly be called 'election' without the satisfaction constituted by the Mediator Christ, because "we are called elect in Christ;" see Walaeus, *Opera* 1:330. According to *SPT* 6.39 God's *affectus boni* "are nothing other than God's ardent will towards us."

XXVII Atque hoc pacto inter Christum tamquam caput et electos tamquam destinata et donata ei membra, quae vivificanda ac in unum corpus redigenda accepit, certus aliquis respectus est ac mutua relatio,* etiam antequam per fidem ei plene uniuntur; sed cum in sese ejus adhuc sunt inimici, quemadmodum inter sponsum et sponsam, quam sanguine suo sibi debuit redimere, atque inter regem et subditos, qui per illum ad obedientiam erant reducendi.

XXVIII Inde est, quod electi in Scripturis vocentur *populus Christi*, etiam antequam a peccatis eum servasset, Mat. 1, 21. et qui nondum ad ipsum erat conversus, Act. 18, 10. Item *oves ejus* pro quibus ponit animam suam, licet nondum ad ipsum essent adductae, Joh. 10, 26. Hinc vocantur *Christi Ecclesia, quam dilexit, et pro qua sese tradidit, ut eam sanctificaret*, ergo et antequam sese tradidit pro ea et antequam eam sanctificavit, Eph. 5, 25. Imo *et servavit nos et vocavit nos vocatione sancta, non ex operibus, sed secundum propositum proprium, et gratiam quae nobis est data in Christo Jesu ante tempora secularia*, 2 Tim. 1, 9. Si vocationis hujus gratia* nobis data est *in Christo*, ergo necessario data est nobis in eo, antequam ut fideles consideraremur, quia fides ex hac vocatione et gratia est.

XXIX Licet ergo Christi meritum non sit electionis nostrae causa,* quia et ipsum Christi meritum ex electione est; tamen electio nostra citra respectum ad futurum Christi meritum peracta non est, quia Christi futurum meritum et tota mediatio ejus inter hujus electionis objecta est, et simul fundamentum* omnium illorum beneficiorum, quae nobis per electionem sunt destinata.

XXX Numerus electorum Deo notus, in hac vita nobis ignotus est, etsi vero respectu reproborum is nonnunquam dicatur grex pusillus, et inter multos vocatos pauci electi Mat. 20. et pauci sint qui porta arcta et via angusta ad salutem contendunt, respectu multitudinis, quae per viam spaciosam et portam latam ad perditionem ruit, Mat. 7. tamen per se considerati tanta sunt multitudo, ut omnibus admirationi sit futura, sicut videre est Esa. 49. item 60. et 66. capite,

By this arrangement, even before they are fully united with Christ through 27
faith, there is some specific connection and mutual relationship* between him, as the head, and the elect, as the members destined for and given to him—and he received them in order to make them alive and gather them into one body. But while they of themselves are his enemies until that time, the relationship is like that of a bridegroom with his bride whom he had to redeem for himself by his own blood; and it is like the relationship of a king and his subjects who were going to be restored to obedience through him.

And so it is that in the Scriptures the elect are called "the people of Christ" 28
even before he had saved them from their sins (Matthew 1:21) and they had not yet turned to him (Acts 18:10). They are also called "his sheep" for whom he lays down his life, although they were not yet brought to Him (John 10:26). Hence, they are called "the Church of Christ which he loved, and for which he gave himself up that he might sanctify her" (Ephesians 5:25[–26]). This means: even before he gave himself up for her and before he sanctified her. For "[God] has saved us and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works but according to his own purpose and grace which He gave us in Christ Jesus before the beginning of the world" (2 Timothy 1:9). If the grace* of this calling has been given to us in Christ, then it must have been given to us in him before we were considered to be believers, since faith arises from this calling and grace.

Consequently, although Christ's merit is not the cause* of our election 29
(because Christ's merit itself also derives from election), our election was not completed without a relationship to Christ's future merit, because Christ's future merit and his whole work of mediation take place among the objects of this election, and are simultaneously the foundation* of all those benefits that have been appointed for us by election.[23]

The number of elect is known to God, but to us in this life it is unknown. 30
And admittedly, that number is sometimes called the "little flock"[24] (in contrast to the reprobate) and "the few who have been elected from the many who have been called" (Matthew 20[:16]); and, "few are those who strive for salvation through the narrow gate and along the straight path," compared to the multitude that rushes to its destruction along the broad way and through the wide gate (Matthew 7:13–14). However, when the number is considered by itself, it is such a multitude that all will be amazed, as we can see in Isaiah 49 (and

23 See also the chapter "Whether Christ is the cause and foundation of election" in Walaeus's *Responsio ad censuram Joannis Arnoldi Corvini* (1625), where he calls it an unstable foundation and an invalid cause if it depends also on the human free choice, Walaeus, *Opera* 2:79–256, 247–249.

24 Luke 12:32.

imo vero praeter eos qui ex Judaeis notati erant 144000, *tanta* Johanni monstrata *fuit eorum turba, ex omni gente, populo et lingua, ut eam numerare nemo posset*, Apoc. 7, 9.

XXXI Explicatis jam plerisque definitionis nostrae membris, restat ut hujus electionis causam* quae Deum ad certas personas* eligendas movit, inquiramus.

XXXII Notum enim est, nonnullos statuere, causam* electionis impulsivam esse futura bona opera, quae Deus eligendos vel fecisse, vel si supervicturi erant, facturos fuisse praevidit.

XXXIII Sed haec sententia Pelagiana a veteri Ecclesia recte fuit haereseos condemnata; quia diserte contradicit Apostolo Paulo Rom. 9, 11. *Nondum natis pueris, cum necdum boni aut mali quicquam fecissent, ut propositum Dei quod est secundum electionem, maneret, non ex operibus, sed ex vocante, dictum est, major serviet minori*, et rursum Rom. 11, 5. *Ita etiam hoc tempore reliquiae secundum electionem gratiae factae sunt; si vero ex gratia, jam non ex operibus, alioquin gratia non est amplius gratia.* Et, si nec vocatio, nec justificatio ex operibus sunt, ut ubique testatur Scriptura, certe nec ipsa electio, quae ad haec omnia est, ex operibus esse potest.* Quia vero haec opinio in Ecclesiis reformatis, paucos sectatores hactenus habuit, in ea refutanda diutius non insistimus.

XXXIV Altera opinio, quae plures fautores inter eos qui Ecclesiae reformatae membra esse volunt, reperit, est eorum, qui volunt, Deum neminem peremptorie ad salutem elegisse, nisi ex fidei ac perseverantiae praevisione antecedanea, saltem ut qualitate* praerequisita, et causa* sine qua non; adeo ut electio haec nihil aliud sit, quam assignatio ultimi praemii ex conditionibus requisitis omnibus antea impletis.

XXXV Haec sententia, si fidem et perseverantiam in fide merum Dei donum esse agnosceret, ex speciali gratia* salvandis concessum, in ordine decreti, et modo loquendi tantum a nobis differret, in reipsa et fundamento* esset consensus;

likewise in chapters 60 and 66). In fact, it is a number beyond the one hundred and forty-four thousand who from among the Jews have been sealed. And so great was the number of those who out of every nation, people and tongue had appeared to John that no-one could count their number (Revelation 7:9).

Now that we have explained most parts of our definition, the task remains for 31
us to investigate the cause* of this election which moved God to elect certain persons.*

For it is well-known that some people state that the impelling cause* for 32
election lies in the future good works which God foresaw that those to be elected either would do, or would have done if they were to stay alive.

But this Pelagian theory was rightly rejected as heresy by the ancient Church, 33
because it clearly contradicts what the apostle Paul says in Romans 9:11: "For before the children were born, before they had done anything good or bad, in order that God's purpose according to election might remain, not because of works but because of Him who calls, it was said: 'the elder shall serve the younger'." And again, from Romans 11:5: "So too at the present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace. And if by grace, then it is no more by works; otherwise grace would no longer be grace." And if neither calling nor justification is based on works—as Scripture everywhere testifies—then indeed also election itself, which pertains to all these things, cannot* be based on works. But because this opinion has had few followers in the Reformed churches until this day, we shall not insist on continuing to refute it any further.

Another opinion, one that finds more supporters from among those who 34
want to be members of the Reformed church,[25] is of those people who deem that God decisively elected only those whose faith and perseverance He foresaw, at least as a prerequisite quality,* and as a cause* *sine qua non*. Hence, this election is nothing else than the allotment of the ultimate reward based on the fact that all required conditions had first been fulfilled.

If this point of view were to acknowledge that faith and perseverance in faith 35
are merely gifts of God that are granted on the basis of a special grace* to the persons to be saved, then it would differ from ours only in the order of the decree and in the way one speaks about it, while there would be agreement

25 Walaeus seems make a distinction between the Remonstrants—who stated that they belonged to the Reformed Church—and genuine Pelagians. Gerardus Joannes Vossius, professor at the Leiden Statencollege from 1615–1619, and professor of rhetoric and history at Leiden university from 1622–1631, published a history of Pelagianism and semi-Pelagianism to show that it is historically incorrect to accuse the Remonstrants of Pelagianism. See Gerardus Joannes Vossius, *Historiae de controversiis, qua Pelagius eiusque reliquiae moverunt, libri septem* (Leiden: Joannes Patius, 1618), 4.

sed quia manifestum est, eos talem fidem et perseverantiam in ea praeexigere, quae partim quidem ex Dei dono, partim vero ex libera voluntate* hominis ortum habet, a Pelagianismo nulla ratione liberari potest; et pugnat cum eo quod Apostolus dicit, *ejus laudem non esse ex hominibus sed ex Deo*, Rom. 2. vers. ult. et *non esse currentis, nec volentis, sed miserentis Dei*, Rom. 9, 16. *et quis prior dedit ei quod retribuatur ei, nam ex ipso, per ipsum et in ipso sunt omnia*, Rom. 11, 35–36. Item 1 Cor. 3, 6. *Paulus plantat, Apollo rigat, sed Deus est qui incrementum dat, non ergo qui plantat, est aliquid, nec qui rigat, sed qui incrementum dat Deus*, et similia plurima, in quibus Scriptura omnia homini adimit, ut totum transcribat Deo, ut qui gloriatur, non in se ipso sed in solo Domino glorietur.

XXXVI Quid, quod haec sententia incidit in opinionem illam quam Thesi 33. refutavimus, et quam ipsi aliquando in scriptis suis condemnant, nempe electionem quoque esse factam secundum praevisa opera, nam nulla fides est salvifica, nisi quae per caritatem operatur, Gal. 5, 6. nulla quoque ad salutem perseverat, nisi quae fructibus suis est ornata, Matt. 13. et bonis operibus conjuncta, Jac. 2. et praemium ultimum quoque dabitur in illo die *secundum id quod unusquisque gessit in corpore suo sive bonum sive malum*, 2 Cor. 5, 10. Unde evidenter consequitur, si electio est facta secundum fidei ac perseverantiae praevisionem, eam etiam esse factam secundum praevisionem operum, quae unusquisque partim ex gratia, partim ex propria voluntate* ac libertate (ut ipsi sentiunt) facturus fuit.

XXXVII Adde quod haec ipsorum electio plane est supervacua, et nullum fructum homini electo affert, nec in hac vita, nec in futura. Non in hac vita, quia perseverantiam ultimam in fide et fidei obedientia omnia beneficia ad credendum et perseverandum requisita, necessario antecedunt. Nec in futura vita, quia vita aeterna perseverantibus in fide debetur ex vi generalis decreti, *Quicunque credit et ad finem usque perseverat, salvabitur*, quod generale decretum

regarding its actual substance and basis.* But because they evidently require beforehand such a faith and perseverance in it which partly have their origin in the gift of God but partly also in the free will* of man, it can in no way be exonerated from the teaching of Pelagianism.[26] And it conflicts with what the apostle says: "His praise is not from men but from God" (Romans 2:29), and that "it does not depend upon man's will or effort but upon God's mercy" (Romans 9:16). And: "Or who has first given a gift to God that he might be repaid? For from Him and through Him and to Him are all things" (Romans 11:35–36). See also 1 Corinthians 3:6[–7]: "Paul plants, Apollos waters, but God gives the growth. So neither he who plants nor he who waters is anything, but God who gives the growth"—and a great many similar texts in which Scripture removes everything from man in order to ascribe everything to God, so that he who boasts, does not boast in himself but in God.[27]

This point of view falls in line with the opinion that we refuted in thesis 33 and which they themselves sometimes condemn in their own writings,[28] namely that election also occurs according to foreseen works on the pretext that no faith is saving faith except that which works through love (Galatians 5:6), that moreover no faith perseveres unto salvation, except that which is adorned with its fruits (Matthew 13) and accompanied by good works (James 2), and that, according to 2 Corinthians 5:10, on that great day the ultimate reward will also be given "according to what each person has done in the body, be it good or evil." Consequently, it is evident that if election occurs according to foreseen faith and perseverance, it is also according to the foreseen works that each person was going to do—partly by grace, partly by his own will* and freedom (as they think). 36

Add to this the fact that this election of theirs is clearly redundant and that it bears no fruit for an elected person, neither in this life nor in the future life. Not in this life, because all the benefits that are required for believing and persevering must of necessity come before the ultimate perseverance in faith and in the obedience of faith. And not in the future life, because eternal life is due to those who persevere in faith by virtue of the general decree that "whoever believes and perseveres to the end shall be saved" [Matthew 37

26 In his *Responsio ad censuram Joannis Arnoldi Corvini* (1625) Walaeus states that the axioms of Arminius are Pelagian. Walaeus, *Opera* 2:106; cf. Walaeus, *Opera* 1:369, 2:171.

27 2 Corinthians 10:17.

28 Walaeus probably has in mind the passages in which Arminius rejects the charge of Pelagianism; see Jacobus Arminius, *The Works of James Arminius*, translated by James Nichols and William Nichols, 3 vols. (London: Longman, 1825–1875), 2:19, 3:482, 657–658; cf. Den Boer, *God's Twofold Love*, 189–190.

hanc electionem peremptoriam certarum personarum* antecedere, ipsimet agnoscunt. Quemadmodum si magistratus aliquis supremus decretum generale condidisset, quo piratis omnibus intra certum tempus in patriam redeuntibus venia concederetur, supervacua atque ab omni sapienter agendi ratione* aliena essent decreta alia, per quae singulis eorum, quos domum redituros norunt, venia denuo decerneretur.

XXXVIII Ut jam sigillatim non vindicemus plurima atque evidentia* Sacrae Scripturae loca, in quibus et fides, et sanctitas, et perseverantia in iis, ex electione manifesto deducuntur, ut Matt. 24, 24. *Fieri non potest ut electi seducantur*, Actor. 13, 48. *Crediderunt quotquot erant ordinati ad vitam aeternam*. Rom. 8, 29. *Quos praecognovit, eos praedestinavit, etc. quos praedestinavit, eos vocavit*. Item Rom. 9, 11. *Nondum natis pueris, antequam boni aut mali quicquam fecissent, etc*. sic Rom. 11, 4. *Reservavi mihi septem millia*, et vers. 5. *Ita etiam nunc reservatio secundum electionem gratiae facta est*, etc. *Electi sumus in Christo ante jacta fundamenta mundi ut essemus sancti*, Eph. 1, 4. et plurima alia, passim in scriptis Propheticis et Apostolicis occurrentia; quae nullis exceptionibus aut explicationibus contrariis hactenus labefactari potuerunt, sicuti facile nobis esset demonstrare,* si intra Thesium modum nos continere non cogeremur.

XXXIX Statuimus ergo ex Sacrae Scripturae plurimis et manifestis locis, causam* quae Deum ad nos prae ceteris eligendos movit, esse solum ejus beneplacitum et indebitam gratiam. Nam *miseretur cujus miseretur, et commiseratur quem commiseratus fuerit*, Rom. 9, 15. et 16. *Non est volentis, nec currentis, sed miserentis Dei*, et denuo vers. 18. *Cujus vult, miseretur*, unde et vers. 11. dixit, *propositum hoc secundum electionem manere, non ex operibus, sed ex vocante*, id est, sola vocantis εὐδοκίᾳ, sicuti hujus vocis usus ubique postulat. Inde quoque Rom. 11, 5. haec electio *electio gratiae* appellatur, et Eph. 1, 5. *Deus et Pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi, nos praedestinasse* dicitur, *in filiorum adoptionem per Jesum Christum in se ipsum, secundum beneplacitum voluntatis* suae*.

XL Nec propterea sequitur, hanc Dei εὐδοκίαν vel fatalem esse vel temerariam, id est, sine certa ratione* factam, quia Dei voluntas* nunquam a sua sapientia,

24:13]. They themselves acknowledge that the general decree comes before this decisive election of certain persons.* One may compare it to this: if some supreme magistrate had composed a general decree whereby pardon would be granted to all pirates who return to the fatherland within a certain time, other decrees granting forgiveness a second time to every individual whom they knew were going to come home would be redundant and also foreign to every reasonable basis* of wise action.[29]

We shall not now present the individual cases from obvious* texts of Holy 38
Scripture that declare faith, holiness, and persevering in them as clearly stemming from election, such as Matthew 24:24: "It is not possible that the elect are led astray." See also Acts 13:48: "And as many as were ordained to eternal life believed;" and Romans 8:29: "Those whom he foreknew he predestined," etc.; "and those whom he predestined he called." Also Romans 9:11: "For while the boys were not yet born, and before they had done anything good or evil," etc., and similarly in Romans 11:4: "I have kept for myself seven thousand men," and "so too at the present time there is a remnant, chosen by grace" (verse 5), etc. And Ephesians 1:4: "For we were chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world that we should be holy." See also a great many other texts which can be found everywhere in the writings of the prophets and apostles. Thus far it has been impossible to overturn these texts by means of any restriction or contrary explanation, as we could easily demonstrate* if we were not constrained to keep ourselves within the confines of these theses.

Consequently, on the basis of a great number of obvious texts of Holy Scrip- 39
ture we state that the cause* which moved God to elect us above others is solely his good pleasure and undue grace. "For He has mercy on whom He has mercy and he has compassion upon whom He has compassion" (Romans 9:15); and "it does not depend upon man's will or effort, but upon God's mercy" (Romans 9:16); and again: "He has mercy upon whomever He wills" (Romans 9:18). Hence he also said that "this purpose of election continues" (Romans 9:11), not because of works but because of the one who calls; that is, solely through the good pleasure (*eudokia*) of the one who is calling, as is required by the usage of this word everywhere. That is why this election is also called an election of grace in Romans 11:5. And therefore it says that "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ has destined us to be his sons through Jesus Christ, according to the good pleasure of his will"* (Ephesians 1:5).

But the consequence is not that this *eudokia* ['good pleasure'] of God is 40
ordained either by fate or at random (i.e., brought about with no specific

29 For the example of the pirates see also Walaeus, *Opera* 1:336.

ac proinde nec a recta ratione est sejuncta, sed cum ea semper conspirat, etsi nobis in sola Dei benigna erga nos voluntate sit acquiescendum. Quemadmodum id recte ab Augustino monetur epist. 105.[a] *Quia universa ista massa merito damnata est, contumeliam debitam reddit justitia, honorem donat indebitum gratia, non meriti praerogativa, non fati necessitate,* non temeritate fortunae, sed altitudine divitiarum sapientiae et scientiae Dei, quam non aperit, sed clausam miratur Apostolus, clamans: O altitudo divitiarum sapientiae et scientiae Dei, quam inscrutabilia sunt judicia ejus et impervestigabiles viae ejus! quis enim cognovit sensum Domini? aut quis consiliarius ejus fuit?* etc.

XLI Usus hujus doctrinae multi et insignes sunt in Ecclesia Christi; nam verae humilitatis est magistra, solidae in Deo fiduciae fundamentum,* fons gaudii spiritualis et spei Christianae, materia certa consolationis in adversis, tolerantiae in cruce, confirmationis contra aliorum apostasiam, calcar gratitudinis erga Deum, caritatis erga proximum, et cetera plurima, quorum omnium illustria exempla ex sacris literis afferri possunt, nisi brevitati studeremus.

XLII Sed usus hi tum demum plenam suam habent efficaciam, cum electi de sui electione certiores redduntur. Quod contingit, non ex aliquo enthusiasmo, aut divinorum judiciorum scrutatione temeraria; sed ex certis ejus effectis et notis, quas profani quidem ignorant et contemnunt, pii vero in serio sui examine cum

[a] Augustine, *Ep*. 194.5 (= *Ep*. 105 in old numbering; CSEL 57:179–180).

reason*),[30] because God's will* is never separated from his wisdom and so not from sound reasoning, but is always in accordance with it, even though it is only in God's kindly will towards us that we should take our repose. This is rightly pointed out by Augustine in his Epistle 105: "Because that whole lump of clay is justly condemned, justice renders the vessel of dishonor what it deserves, while grace bestows an honor undeserved, not for any privilege of merit, not by the inevitability* of fate, not by some random fortune, but through the 'depth of the riches of the wisdom and the knowledge of God,' which the apostle does not reveal but admires as hidden. [In Romans 11:33–34,] he exclaims: 'O the depth of the riches of the wisdom and the knowledge of God, how inscrutable are his judgments and how unsearchable are his ways! For who knows the mind of the Lord or who has been his counselor?'" etc.

This doctrine provides many significant advantages to Christ's Church; for it 41
teaches humility, it is the basis* of solid trust in God, the source of spiritual joy and Christian hope, the true ground for consolation in adversities, for forbearance in suffering, for steadfastness in the face of the apostasy of others, a spur for gratitude towards God, for love towards the neighbor, and a great many other things. We could produce very clear instances of them from the sacred writings, if we were not striving after brevity.

But these advantages have their full impact only then when the elect are 42
made more certain of their election. This does not depend on some spiritual enthusiasm[31] or mindless investigation into divine judgments; it happens on the basis of its sure effects and signs, which profane people do not know—and despise—but which pious people discover in themselves with joy, following

30 In his philosophical treatise, *Compendium ethicae Aristotelicae ad normam veritatis Christianae revocatum* (Leiden: Elzevir, 1620), Walaeus elaborates on the difference between the Christian concept of providence and the Epicurean view that everything comes about by chance and without any purpose, and also the Stoic view that everything happens by fate; Walaeus, *Opera* 2:277. For an English translation see John Monfasani, "Antonius de Waele," in *Cambridge Translations of Renaissance Philosophical Texts*, I, Moral Philosophy, ed. Jill Kraye (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 120–129, 126. On the philosophical background of Walaeus's view; see Henri A. Krop "Philosophy and the Synod of Dordt: Aristotelianism, Humanism and the Case against Arminianism," in *Revisiting the Synod of Dordt (1618–1619)* ed. Aza Goudriaan and Fred A. van Lieburg (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 49–79, 58–60.

31 'Enthusiasm' is a pejorative term used to refer to direct inspirations that pass outside of Scripture, such as the sixteenth-century Anabaptists and Schwenckfeldians claimed to receive from God. See Michael Heyd, *"Be Sober and Reasonable": The Critique of Enthusiasm in the Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 15–23.

gaudio in se deprehendunt, vel si tempore tentationis, aut negligentia ipsorum forte in ipsis langueant, per preces, verbi* auditum, sacramentorum* usum, colloquia cum sanctis, et caritatis opera, etc. in se denuo excitare omnibus modis satagunt. De quibus effectis et notis ampli tractatus a viris piis conscripti sunt, qui tamen omnes sub *vocatione secundum propositum, justificatione per fidem, sanctificatione per Spiritum, et ejusdem Spiritus Sancti, tamquam arrhabonis, haereditatis nostrae obsignatione*, comprehendi possunt, sicut ab Apostolo Paulo certa serie referuntur in Epistola ad Rom. 8, 14. et deinceps.

XLIII Quorum omnium supremus finis* est, demonstratio gratuitae misericordiae Dei, et manifestatio divitiarum gloriae ejus, erga vasa misericordiae, quae praeparavit ad gloriam, Rom. 9, 23. et Eph. 1, 6. in quo fine et nos libenter finimus.

DE REPROBATIONE

XLIV Explicato hac ratione primo hujus praedestinationis membro, reliquum est, ut de altero quoque agamus. Nam licet ex antecedentibus doctrina reprobationis magna ex parte innotescat, cum illius natura* sine hac cognosci atque explicari vix possit; tamen ne quid hic desideretur, et quia haec pars ingenio humano maxime videtur adversa, nos paucis, quid de hoc quoque membro ex Scriptura sentiendum sit, deinceps proponemus.

XLV Reprobum, Graece ἀδόκιμον proprie* vocatur, quod improbatur et rejicitur, quemadmodum Jer. 6, 30. de populi maxima parte Deus inquit, *Argentum reprobum vocabuntur illi, quia Jehova abjecit vel reprobavit eos*. Utitur hac voce* in simili significatione Apostolus 2 Tim. 3, 8. Heb. 6, 8. et alibi.

XLVI Reprobationis vero illius aeternae, cui temporaria respondet, *cum Deo omnia sua opera ab aeterno sint nota*, Act. 15, 18. duplex enunciationis modus* occurrit in verbo Dei. Primus est negativus, alter affirmativus, uterque vero reprobationem esse evincit, et uterque synecdochice* pro tota reprobatione nonnunquam ponitur.

XLVII Negativum primo, ipsa vox* electionis infert, ut antea notavimus; qui enim aliquos tantum eligit, reliquos praeterit ac relinquit. Hinc Apostolus Rom. 11, 7.

serious self-examination.[32] Or, if these advantages perhaps fade away in them in times of temptation or through the believers' own negligence, believers make every effort to revive them in themselves by prayer, by listening to the Word,* by using the sacraments,* by conversations with fellow-believers and by works of charity, etc. Pious men have written ample treatises about these effects and signs, and they can all be included under calling according to the [divine] purpose, justification through faith, sanctification through the Spirit, and the seal of that same Holy Spirit as guarantee of our inheritance, as the apostle Paul says in a set order in his letter to the Romans 8:14 and following.

The ultimate goal* of all these things is the demonstration of God's gracious 43
mercy and the display of the riches of his glory towards the vessels of mercy which He has prepared for glory (Romans 9:23 and Ephesians 1:6). And with this goal we too happily reach our goal.

On Reprobation

Now that we have explained the first component of this predestination in 44
this way, it remains for us to discuss the second element, too.[33] For whereas the doctrine of reprobation has for a large part become clear from the preceding (because it is hardly possible to know and explain its nature* without it), yet lest we leave anything out, and because this part seems completely opposed to human understanding, we shall put forth in a few words what we ought to think about this component, too, based on Scripture.

The word 'reprobate' (in Greek, *adokimos*) refers in its proper* sense to what 45
is disapproved of and rejected, as in Jeremiah 6:30, where God declares that the majority of the people "will be called rejected silver, because Jehovah has rejected and disapproved of them." The apostle uses this word* in the same sense in 2 Timothy 3:8 and Hebrews 6:8, and elsewhere.

Eternal reprobation, to which temporal reprobation corresponds because 46
"God knows all his works from eternity" (Acts 15:18) is referred to in God's Word* in two ways.* The first way is negative, the second affirmative. Both provide convincing evidence for the fact that reprobation exists and both are sometimes used by way of synecdoche* for reprobation as a whole.

First, the very word* 'election' implies something negative, as we have 47
pointed out previously.[34] For the one who is choosing only some people, passes over and leaves aside others. Hence the apostle places the elect over against

32 The phrasing differs slightly from the *Canons of Dort*, 1, 12, where the elect are said to observe in themselves the infallible fruits of election with a spiritual joy and holy pleasure.

33 On reprobation cf. Walaeus, *Opera* 1:372–374, 2:249–256.

34 See thesis 9 above.

electos opponit *reliquis*, cum inquit, *electi* assecuti sunt, *reliqui* occalluerunt. Sic Christus Matt. 7, 23. operariis iniquitatis inquit, *nunquam novi vos*, cum electi Rom. 8. et alibi, *praecogniti a Deo* appellentur. Sic Joh. 10, 26. de iisdem ait, *sed vos non creditis, non enim estis ex ovibus meis, sicut vobis dixi, oves meae vocem meam audiunt, et ego cognosco eas, etc*. Sic quoque Joh. 15, 19. *ego elegi vos ex mundo, propterea odit vos mundus*, et 17, 9. *non rogo pro mundo, sed pro iis quos dedisti mihi, quia tui sunt*. Item Apoc. 13, 8. et 20, 15. *inscripti in libro vitae* opponuntur iis, *quorum nomina non sunt scripta* in libro vitae agni.

XLVIII Affirmativum quid et magis poenale includunt alii loquendi modi,* qui subinde occurrunt. Tales sunt: *Major serviet minori;* item, *Esau odio habui*, Rom. 9, 12. 13. et vers. 18. *Quem vult, indurat; vasa facta ad dedecus*, vers. 21. *vasa irae ad interitum coagmentata*, vers. 22. Ita Petrus 1. Epist. 2, 8. dicit, eos impegisse in lapidem offendiculi, εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐτέθησαν, *ad quod etiam positi sunt*, et Judas in Epistola sua, vers. 4. vocat eos, *homines jam olim descriptos ad hunc interitum*.

XLIX Ex hoc *gemino* loquendi modo,* oritur distinctio a magnis Theologis in hoc negotio usurpata, in reprobationem negativam et affirmativam, quam alii praeteritionem et praedamnationem vocant; ex quorum explicatione hujus dogmatis natura magis innotescet.

L Negativa reprobatio dicitur, actus* aeternus divinae potestatis et judicii, quo secundum consilium voluntatis* suae, reliquorum, quos non elegit, eousque misereri non constituit, ut peculiari illa et indebita electionis gratia eos donaret. Affirmativa vero, quo eosdem in perditionis massa juste relictos, aut

those who are left aside, when he says that "the elect have obtained [grace] and the rest were hardened" (Romans 11:7). Likewise Christ addresses the workers of iniquity by saying, "I never knew you" (Matthew 7:23), whereas the elect are called "those whom God knew beforehand" (Romans 8[:29], and elsewhere). He thus addresses the same [workers of iniquity] by saying: "But you do not believe because you are not of my sheep, as I said to you. My sheep hear my voice and I know them, etc." (John 10:26). So too in John 15:19: "I have chosen you out of the world, because the world hates you," and in John 17:9: "I do not pray for the world, but for those You have given me, for they are yours." In the same way, Revelation 13:8 and 20:15 place "those who are written in the book of life" over against "those whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb."

Other ways* of speaking include something affirmative as well as something 48
of a more punitive nature, and they occur frequently. Such are: "The elder shall serve the younger" and "Esau I hated" (Romans 9:12–13). And "He hardens whomever He will" (Romans 9:18); there are "vessels made for honorable use" and "vessels of wrath made for destruction" (Romans 9:21, 22). Likewise Peter declares that "they stumbled upon the rock of offense *eis ho kai etethēsan* whereto they also were appointed" (1 Peter 2:8). And Jude calls them "people who long ago were marked out for this destruction" (Jude 4).

On the basis of the twofold way* of speaking in this matter, leading the- 49
ologians have made a distinction between negative and affirmative reprobation, which others respectively call 'a passing over' and 'pre-damnation.'[35] The nature of this dogmatic point will become clear when we explain the terms.

Negative reprobation refers to an eternal act of divine power and judgment 50
whereby, in keeping with the counsel of his will,* God did not resolve to have mercy on those whom He did not elect (to the extent that He would grant them that special and undue grace of election). Affirmative reprobation, however, is the act whereby He resolved to impose the punishments finally deserved upon

35 It is difficult to identify who Walaeus has in mind, but see Walaeus, *Opera* 2:250–251 for a broader discussion. The distinction between 'negative' and 'affirmative' reprobation was formulated already in the early fourteenth century. Nicolas of Lyra, in his influential *Postilla*, may have been the first to formulate this distinction, in a gloss on Romans 9:17. See Sinnema, "Issue of Reprobation," 32–33. The term 'negative' does not have the modern connotation, but means "without a positive act of the will." This bipartite definition of reprobation was gradually accepted in Reformed theology and offered a more nuanced position than, for instance, Calvin. The *Canons of Dort* also reflect the late medieval negative-positive definition of reprobation, with God's will as the reason for the negative side (*praeteritio*) and sin as the reason for the positive side of reprobation (*damnatio*); see *Canons of Dort*, 1, 15.

naturae* et Evangelii lumine diversis modis ex proprio arbitrio* abutentes, commeritis tandem poenis afficere constituit.

LI Uterque hic actus* hominem peccatorem et condemnationis reum pro objecto habet, sicuti tota vetustas recte sensit, et supra de electione a nobis est demonstratum,* quemadmodum et Apostolus testatur Rom. 9, 21. An non habet potestatem figulus *ex eodem luto* faciendi aliud vas ad decus, aliud ad dedecus. Quod et hinc liquet, quod Deus non nisi peccatum odit, non nisi peccatores certo judicio indurat, quod non nisi peccatoribus irascitur, non nisi dignos et merentes ad interitum aptat, aut ad judicium proscribit.

LII Nec tamen id sic est capiendum, ac si hi duo actus* revera essent diversi, (nam Deus unico actu omnia ab aeterno apud se determinavit,* ut supra quoque monuimus) sed id propter diversas res* eodem decreto contentas, et propter diversos ejus respectus, termini* scilicet a quo, et ad quem, sic a nobis enunciatur. Terminus* enim a quo reprobationis, est derelictio in communi* corruptione et reatu. Terminus* vero ad quem, est non tantum communis* damnatio, sed certus quoque damnationis gradus. Unde necessario infertur, quemadmodum praeteritio praesupponit commune* peccatum, ita praedamnationem in divina praescientia* praesupponere insuper omnia quoque reliqua peculiaria peccata, tam adversus legem, quam adversus Evangelium committenda, quae ejusmodi poenam erant commeritura.

LIII Neuter ergo hic actus* injustitiae argui potest,* quia dignum rejectione, indebita gratia non donare, non injustitiae, sed judicii liberi actus est, quemadmodum Apostolus indicat, cum dicit, *An non habet potestatem figulus ex eodem luto faciendi aliud quidem vas ad decus, aliud vero ad dedecus?* Rom. 9, 21. et, *Quis prior dedit ei, quod retribuatur ei?* Rom. 11. 35. Rursum autem, ex peccati singularis et praevisi incremento ad certum quoque gradum poenae quempiam destinare, justitiae vindicatricis, non injustitiae actio est, quemadmodum id Apostolus ibidem notat, *Quid si Deus volens ostendere iram, et notam facere potentiam suam, multa lenitate pertulit vasa irae coagmentata ad*

those same people who had been left, justly, in the lump of perdition, or who abuse the light of nature* and of the Gospel in various ways by their own free choice.*

Both acts* have sinful man as their object, sinful man liable to condem- 51
nation, as all the ancient authors rightly have observed, and which we have demonstrated* above regarding election,[36] just as the apostle also testifies: "Does not the potter have power to make from the same lump one vessel made for honorable use, and another for dishonorable?" (Romans 9:21). From this it becomes clear that God hates only sin, and in his certain judgment hardens only sinners, and that his wrath concerns sinners only, and that He makes fit for destruction or proscribes for judgment only those who rightly deserve it.

However, we should not take this to mean that these two acts* were really dif- 52
ferent; for from eternity God within himself has determined* everything in one single act, as we have pointed out above.[37] We employ this distinction because various things* are contained in the same divine decree, and because it has different aspects (i.e., the 'point* from which' and the 'point* to which').[38] For the point* from which reprobation arises is the leaving-behind in the common* corruption and liability. But the point* to which reprobation leads is not only common* damnation, but also the specific degree of damnation. Therefore, it is necessarily concluded that, as 'passing over' presupposes common* sin, so also 'pre-damnation' in God's foreknowledge* presupposes all the other particular sins that will be committed against the Law and against the Gospel—sins that would be deserving of such punishment.

Therefore it cannot* be argued here that either act* is an unjust one, for 53
to not grant undue grace to someone who deserves rejection is not an act of injustice but of free judgment, as the apostle indicates when he says: "Does the potter not have the power to make from the same lump one vessel for honorable use and another dishonorable?" (Romans 9:21), and: "Who has ever given a gift to him that he might be repaid?" (Romans 11:35). And again, to destine anyone to a specific degree of punishment proportionate to the particular and foreseen sin, is an act of vindictive justice, not an act of injustice, as the apostle declares: "What if God, willing to show his wrath and to make known his power, has endured with much patience the vessels of wrath made for destruction?"

---

36 Thesis 21 above.

37 Thesis 20 above.

38 The distinction between *terminus a quo* ('the point from which') and *terminus ad quem* ('the point to which') corresponds with the distinction between negative and affirmative reprobation, *praeteritio* and *damnatio*.

interitum? Rom. 9, 22. si pertulit multa lenitate, ergo et in sua praescientia* abutentes divina lenitate pertulit, et sic tandem ad interitum justum ordinavit.

LIV Hoc ut recte intelligatur, diligenter notandum est, hanc praeteritionem non omnem gratiam in praeteritis tollere aut negare, sed eam tantum quae electis est peculiaris. Ea vero quae per communis* providentiae administrationem,* sive sub lege naturae,* sive sub gratia Evangelica, hominibus vario dimenso dispensatur, per hunc praeteritionis actum* non adimitur, sed potius praesupponitur: quia non electi, sub illa communi providentiae divinae gubernatione, et arbitrii* sui exercitio, relinquuntur.

LV Haec autem communis* providentiae administratio* eam beneficiorum externorum atque internorum communicationem semper conjunctam habet, quae in natura* quidem integra ad salutem sufficiebat, ut in Angelis rejectis, et genere humano toto, in primo parente ante lapsum considerato, manifestum est; in natura* vero corrupta, tanta reliqua facta est, aut naturae* sub Evangelio superaddita, ut omni excusationis praetextu coram divino judicio nudati ac privati sint, quemadmodum Apostolus testatur, Act. 14, 27. Rom. 1, 20. et 2, 1. Item Joh. 15, 22. 1 Cor. 4, 3. et alibi.

LVI Atque ideo recte Synodus Arausicana, can. 25.[a] definivit: *Aliquos divina potestate ad malum praedestinatos esse, non tantum non*[b] *credimus, sed si quis sit*

[a] DH 397. [b] non tantum credimus: Walaeus, *Opera* 1:66.

(Romans 9:22). If He has endured with much patience, therefore even in his foreknowledge* He has endured those who abused this divine patience, and so, ultimately, it was to a just destruction that he ordained them.

In order to understand this correctly, it should be noted carefully that this 54
'passing over' does not remove or deny all grace from those who have been passed over, but only the grace that is peculiar to the elect. But the grace that is distributed to mankind in various amounts through the administration* of general* providence (whether under the law of nature* or under gospel-grace) is not taken away by this act* of 'passing over,' but rather is presupposed by it, since the non-elect remain under the general government of divine providence and under the exercise of their own free choice.*[39]

This administration* of general* providence, however, is always accompa- 55
nied by that communication of external and internal benefits which in the state* of integrity certainly was sufficient unto salvation. This is evident in the case of the rejected angels[40] and the whole human race (as considered in its first parents before the fall).[41] But in the state* of corruption, so much of that communication remained (or was given additionally to nature* under the Gospel), that when they appear before the divine judgment they are stripped and deprived of every pretext for an excuse, as the apostle testifies in Acts 14:27, Romans 1:20 and 2:1. Likewise, John 15:22, 1 Corinthians 4:3, and elsewhere.[42]

And therefore the Synod of Orange (canon 25)[43] rightly made the following 56
distinction: "Not only do we not believe that by God's power some have been predestined to evil, but also that if anyone wants to believe such evil then we

39 In the *Compendium* Walaeus explains that divine providence to which all human actions, good and bad, are subject does not exclude human freedom: 'man freely does what he does because God decreed that he should freely perform these actions rather than those;' see Walaeus, *Opera* 2:277; cf. Monfasani, "De Waele," 127.

40 Angels are subject to God's predestination; see thesis 7 above and *SPT* 12.32.

41 Walaeus argues that reprobation does not imply that the reprobate lacked sufficient grace to be saved, because the reprobate angels and human beings as seen considered in Adam had enough grace to remain in the state of integrity. This thesis contains a summary of the argument in the *Loci*; see Walaeus, *Opera* 1:373.

42 According to Arminius, human responsibility implies that all share in sufficient general grace; see Den Boer, *God's Twofold Love*, 179–184. According to Walaeus, general grace is sufficient for salvation only in the state of integrity (*status integritatis*), but no longer after the fall (*status post lapsum*).

43 The Second Council of Orange (529) rejected a modified form of Pelagianism that held that faith is an act of free will without previous internal grace. The council maintained that faith always results from the electing grace of God but at the same time rejected the view that the reprobate are predestined to sin.

qui tantum malum credere velit, ei cum omni detestatione Anathema dicimus. Nam peccata communia* Deus in illis invenit, non fecit, ut antea monuimus; et licet Deus ex justo suo judicio, etsi nobis occulto, eos amplius deserat et induret, Rom. 9, 18. tamen ipsi primi per arbitrium* suum occallescunt, Rom. 11, 7. ac communis* providentiae beneficia deserunt, et lenitate Dei abutuntur, ut Paulus testatur Rom. 1, 18, 26. et 28. item Rom. 9, 22. 2 Thess. 2, 11. et alibi. Ac licet Apostolus quoque Petrus 1. Epist. cap. 2 dicat, *eos ad hoc esse positos*, ut in lapidem offensionis impingant, tamen non nisi antecedenti aliqua ingratitudine id merentes, ad hoc positi sunt; idque eo modo ac ratione, quae justitiae omnem laudem Deo, ipsis vero solis culpam omnem relinquat; de quo indurandi modo alias per Dei gratiam agemus. Quod vero electos vel praeveniat,[a] ne eodem modo arbitrio suo abutantur, vel si abusi sunt, ut resurgant et resipiscant, id ex gratia ac misericordia singulari quae nulli debetur, non ex ipsorum arbitrio causam* habet.

LVII Unde liquet, etsi peccatum sit conditio in reprobandis praesupposita (quam causam* sine qua non vocare licet) tamen cum illi quorum Deus misertus est, quoque peccatores essent, et non minus quam reliqui suo arbitrio* abusi, aut abusuri, nisi electionis gratia antevertisset, supremam et adaequatam reprobationis causam* esse Dei liberam potestatem, et justam nullique obligatam voluntatem,* quemadmodum Apostolus loquitur Rom. 9, 18. *Cujus vult, miseretur, et quem vult, indurat*. et v. 21. *An non habet potestatem figulus*, etc. item v. 22. *Quid si Deus volens ostendere iram, et notam facere τὸ δυνατὸν αὐτοῦ, potestatem suam*, etc.

LVIII Nec voluntas* haec est absoluta,* quasi ratione* careat, aut tyrannica (absit verbo blasphemia) sicut quidam vocem *absolute** intelligunt, cum hinc nobis

[a] praeveniant: Walaeus, *Opera* 1:66.

declare them 'anathema' with all detestation." For in those people God did not make the common* sins but found them there, as we have noted before.[44] And although God, in his just but to us hidden judgment, does abandon and harden them more and more (Romans 9:18), yet it is they who by their own free choice* first become hardened (Romans 11:7) and abandon the benefits of general* providence; they abuse God's longsuffering, as Paul testifies in Romans 1:18, 26, and 28. Likewise Romans 9:22, 2 Thessalonians 2:11, and elsewhere. But although the apostle Peter too, in chapter two of his first letter, says that "they were set to stumble on the rock of offense" [1 Peter 2:8], yet they are set to do this only because they deserve it by some antecedent ingratitude. And it happens in such a way and manner, that all praise of justice is for God, while for them there remains only all the blame. We shall deal with this way of hardening another time, God willing.[45] But as to the fact that God either prevents the elect from abusing their free choice in the same way, or, if they have abused it, that they arise and repent, that has its origin* in God's singular grace and mercy—which is owed to nobody—and not in their own choice.

From this it is clear that although sin is a condition that is presupposed in 57
those who are going to be rejected (a cause* that can be called a condition *sine qua non*)—yet the highest and adequate cause* of reprobation is God's free power and his just will* that is owed to no-one, since those on whom God had mercy were also sinners, who have abused or would abuse their free choice* no less than the others do, if the grace of election had not prevented it. This is what the apostle says in Romans 9:18: "He has mercy upon whomever He wills, and hardens [the heart] of whomever He wills." See also verse 21: "Has the potter no right [over the clay]?" etc., and verse 22: "What if God, willing to show his wrath and to make known his power," etc.

And this will,* however, is not absolute,* as if it lacked a reason,* nor is it a 58
tyrannical will (even to use this word is blasphemy). Some interpret the term

44 See thesis 52 above.

45 Walaeus may be referring to *SPT* 30.40 where it is said of the divine calling that the hypocrites are rendered without excuse before God because they do not use the grace of the calling in which they share. In his *Loci* he also explains how God's active hardening is not sin on his part. That human sin follows from the privation of grace is accidental (*per accidens*), since the human will that is deprived of God's grace does not of itself choose sin because of this privation but because it is left to itself—just like the fact that warm water becomes cold if no fire is applied to it is not because of the absence of that fire, but because the tendency of the water is not being impeded; see Walaeus, *Opera* 1:373–374.

invidiam creare conantur; sed sapientissima est, ordinatissima et sanctissima. Nam primo tyrannidis accusari non potest,* qui jus suum ab uno delinquente et reo exigit, etsi id ab aliis pariter reis non exigat; deinde qui id in bonos et sanctos fines* facit, *si enim utrique liberarentur, lateret quid peccato per justitiam deberetur, si nemo, quid gratia largiretur*, ut Augustinus *Epist.* 105.[a] convenienter Apostolo loquitur, Rom. 9, 22. et 23.

LIX Imo vero ne quidem absoluta* est, quasi nulla divinae sapientiae constet ratio,* cur hunc potius quam illum rejecerit, etsi ea ratio* in diversitate meritorum quaerenda non sit; sicuti Augustinus de bono perseverantiae, cap. 11.[b] recte monet, *Universae autem viae Domini, misericordia et veritas: impervestigabilis ergo est misericordia, qui cujus vult, miseretur, nullis praecedentibus meritis; et impervestigabilis veritas, quia quem vult, obdurat ejus quidem praecedentibus meritis, sed cum eo cujus miseretur, plerumque communibus*. Et Prosper *De libero arbitrio ad Ruffinum*, *Omnibus in Adae praevaricatione prostratis, nisi quosdam assumeret misericors gratia, maneret super universos inculpata justitia; quae autem sit illius discretionis in consilio Dei causa* vel ratio, et supra facultatem humanae conditionis inquiritur, et sine fidei diminutione nescitur, modo confiteamur, neminem immerito perdi, neminem merito liberari.*[c]

[a] Augustine, *Ep.* 194.5 (= *Ep.* 105 in old numbering; CSEL 57:179). [b] Augustine, *De dono perseverantiae* 11.25 (MPL 45:1007). [c] Prosper of Aquitane, *Epistula ad Rufinum*, cap. 13.14 (MPL 51:85).

'absolute'* in this manner, thereby trying to arouse hatred towards us.[46] But this will is very wise, most carefully arranged, and very holy. For, first of all, it is not possible* to accuse someone of being a tyrant for claiming from a single offender or guilty person what is his right, even though he does not claim this from other persons who are equally guilty. This holds even more for the One who does so for good and holy purposes.* "For if both were to be set free, it would remain unclear what was due to sin because of justice; and if nobody were to be set free it would remain unclear what grace would bountifully bestow" as Augustine (Epistle 105) asserts correctly and in accordance with the apostle in Romans 9:22 and 23.

Indeed, what is more, this will* is not even absolute* in the sense that 59
there is no reason* why in God's wisdom He would have rejected this person rather than another one (even if this reason* should not be looked for in the diversity of merits), as Augustine correctly observes in his *The Good of Perseverance*, chapter 11: "All the Lord's ways are mercy and truth; therefore, his mercy is beyond finding out, by which He has mercy upon whomever He wills, without any preceding merits. And the truth is beyond finding out, because He hardens whomever He wills, even if with preceding merits—but merits that for the most part are in common with the one upon whom He has mercy." And Prosper, writing to Rufinus[47] on free choice says: "Since all have been laid low by Adam's transgression, there would have remained upon all of them a blameless justice unless a merciful grace selected some people. Therefore to inquire into the cause* or reason in God's counsel for this division is to go beyond human capability and it will not be known without destroying faith. Let us confess only that nobody perishes undeservedly and that nobody is saved deservedly."[48]

---

46 In the *Loci* Walaeus explains that the fact that God's will is the highest cause of reprobation does not exclude righteous reasons for reprobation from Acts 13:38; see Walaeus, *Opera* 1:344.

47 About Rufinus we only know that Prosper of Aquitaine (see note 3 above) wrote a letter against the semi-Pelagians to him (c. 426). This letter is the first document of the so called 'semi-Pelagian controversy' and was followed by Prosper's letter that incited Augustine to write his *De praedestinatione sanctorum* and *De dono perseverantiae*.

48 While Prosper continued to maintain with Augustine that the reason why one is and another is not predestined to eternal life lies hidden in God's secret counsel, he emphasized the other side of Augustine's position, i.e., that it was because of their own sin that God did not elect some to eternal life. See Sinnema, "Issue of Reprobation," 15.

LX Imo et ipse Calvinus ac Beza hoc quoque nonnunquam inculcant, contra eos, qui talem aliquam absolutam* in Deo voluntatem* hic comminiscuntur, quales quidam inter Scholasticos* fuerunt. Sic loquitur Calvinus de occulta Dei providentia statim in initio: *Quamquam mihi Dei voluntas summa est causa,* ubique tamen doceo, ubi in consiliis et operibus causa non apparet, apud eum tamen esse absconditam; ut nihil nisi juste et sapienter decreverit. Itaque quod de absoluta potestate nugantur Scholastici, non solum repudio, sed etiam detestor, quia justitiam ejus ab imperio separant.*[a] Et Beza *Colloquio Mompelg*. pagin. 162.[b] *Hanc tamen voluntatem, sive hoc decretum ipsius, nunquam a justitia et vera rectaque ratione* sejungimus, et semper ordinatissimam, quamvis ipsis etiam Angelis inscrutabilem, esse credimus, et propterea miramur et adoramus, nec aliam absolutam in Deo voluntatem agnoscimus.*

[a] John Calvin, *Calumniae nebulonis cuiusdam quibus odio et invidia gravare conatus est doctrinam Ioh. Calvini de occulta Dei providentia Johannis Calvini ad easdem responsio*, (Geneva: Conrad Badius, 1558), reprinted in *CO* 9:257–318. For the quotation see *CO* 9:288. [b] Theodore Beza, *Ad acta colloquii Montisbelgardensis Tubingae edita, Theodori Bezae responsionis pars altera, Editio tertia, in qua praeterea est index adjectus* (Geneva: Joannes le Preux, 1589), 162–163.

Even Calvin[49] himself and Beza have sometimes forcefully impressed this upon those who invented some such absolute* will* in God,[50] as some Scholastics* have done. Immediately at the outset, Calvin speaks about God's hidden providence in this way: "Though in my view God's will is the highest cause,* I always taught that when there appears to be no cause in God's counsels and works, this cause lay hidden with Him, so that He decreed everything in a just and wise manner. Therefore, I not only reject but also detest the triflings of the Scholastics about absolute power, because they separate God's justice from his power."[51] Likewise Beza,[52] in the *Colloquy of Montbéliard*, page 162: "Yet we never separate God's will* or decree from justice and true and sound reason,* and we believe that this will, though unfathomable even by angels, is very well arranged and for that reason we admire and adore it, but we do not acknowledge that there exists some other absolute will in God."[53] 60

49 John Calvin (1509–1564) was the second generation French reformer who codified Reformed Protestantism in his systematic-theological writings, especially his *Institutes*. As leader of the reformed church in Geneva, he published commentaries on almost the entire Bible, and founded an academy. His immediate influence, however, on Reformed Orthodoxy must not be overstated. This is the first time Calvin is quoted in the *SPT* and this quotation is not from the *Institutes*, but from a response to Sebastian Castellio (1515–1563).

50 Remarkably, Walaeus states that 'even' according to Calvin and Beza reprobation was not without a cause. For the problematic status of Calvin and Beza (even within the Reformed camp); see Fornerod, *Registres de la Compagnie des pasteurs de Genève*, 14:xliv–l, 73–74, note 84.

51 In his *Institutes* 3.23.2 Calvin also rejects the *potentia absoluta* and in his *De aeterna Praedestinatione Dei* he calls it the dogma of the Sorbonne. *CO* 8:361. On the issue cf. David C. Steinmetz, *Calvin in Context* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 40–52 and Andreas J. Beck, "'Expositio Reverentialis': Gisbertus Voetius's (1589–1676) Relationship With John Calvin," *Church History and Religious Culture* 91.1–2 (2011), 121–133, especially 128–132.

52 Theodore Beza (1519–1605) was Calvin's successor in Geneva and his biographer. He interpreted Calvin's writings in a supralapsarian way and summarized the doctrine of predestination in tabular form in his treatise *Summa totius Christianismi* (1555). He published an edition of the Greek New Testament with the Vulgate and his own translation and annotations (1565). At the Colloquy of Montbéliard (1586) he debated with the Lutheran Jacob Andreae (1528–1590) on the question whether there was sufficient agreement on Christology, the Lord's Supper, Baptism, and Predestination for intercommunion.

53 Walaeus's *Loci* have the same two quotations from Calvin and Beza to prove that the *status controversionis* is not whether God rejects some people absolutely, that is without a reason, but whether he elects some out of free grace or on the condition of foreseen works or faith. Walaeus, *Opera* 1:332.

LXI Concidunt ergo sua sponte omnes calumniae, quibus haec doctrina a nonnullis gravatur. Ac proinde in Ecclesia Christi, cum omni tamen sobrietate, de ea nonnunquam ex Scriptura Sacra agendum asserimus; quia ex hac comparatione Dei benignitas eo magis erga nos elucet, ut Paulus Rom. 11, 22. monet; et quia hinc nos sub Dei judiciis tanto magis humiliamus, ut justitiam et sapientiam ejus, licet nobis aliquando occultam veneremur et adoremus, sicut idem Apostolus nobis praeit, Rom. 9, 20. et 11, 33. ac deinceps.

Therefore, all the malicious charges with which some people burden this 61
doctrine will fall apart on their own. And accordingly, we assert that in Christ's Church this doctrine sometimes should be treated with all modesty and on the basis of Scripture. From the present comparison God's favor towards us will shine all the more (as Paul points out in Romans 11:22)—so that because of this we humble ourselves so much more before God's judgments in order to honor and adore his (albeit sometimes hidden to us) justice and wisdom, as the apostle gives us an example in Romans 9:20 and 11:33, and following.

DISPUTATIO XXV

De Filii Dei Incarnatione et Unione personali duarum naturarum in Christo

Praeside D. ANTONIO THYSIO
Respondente NICOLAO BALBIANO

THESIS I Postquam de Lege et Evangelio, et iis cohaerente Veteri et Novo Testamento, eorumque inter se convenientia et discrimine, itemque de Praedestinatione, quae primo Christum, inde in eo membra ejus spectat, actum est; consequitur ut de objecto Evangelii, novique foederis fundamento,* *Christi persona,* seu Incarnatione Filii Dei, et personali* duarum naturarum* in Christo unione*, sigillatim agamus.

II Hoc mysterium, post illud de S. S. Trinitate, trium scilicet in una essentia* personarum,* quo tres personae realiter inter se distinctae unam eandemque essentiam habent, et in una numero essentia uniuntur, summum est, quo quidem duae perfectae naturae* in una persona Filii Dei uniuntur; unde Apostolus hoc mysterium, *quod Deus manifestatus est in carne, magnum pietatis mysterium* appellat, 1. ad Timotheum 3, 16.

III Quare etiam humana ratione* doceri aut accipi non potest* quod nullum ejus in tota natura,* perfectum et omnino respondens exstet exemplum, quamvis cum recta ratione non pugnet; verum divinitus e Scriptura doceri et probari,* oculisque fidei accipi debet. Atque in eo indicium est, sublimis et plane divinae doctrinae verbi* Dei, ut quod superiora humanae rationi de Deo ejusque oeconomia* nobis prodat et pandat, quae fide, testimonio* Dei de se verissime testantis, firmissime accipere necesse est.

DISPUTATION 25

On the Incarnation of the Son of God and the Personal Union of the Two Natures in Christ

President: Antonius Thysius
Respondent: Nicolaus Balbianus[1]

We have now treated Law and Gospel (including the Old and New Testaments that are bound up with them) and their similarities and differences. So too for Predestination, first, regarding Christ, and thereafter his members, who are in him.[2] It follows that we should next give separate treatments of what is the object of the Gospel and the basis* for the new covenant, namely, the person* of Christ, or the incarnation of the Son of God, and the personal* union of the two natures* of Christ. 1

Second to the mystery of the Holy Trinity—namely of three persons* in one essence,* whereby the three persons, though really distinct from each other, have one and the same essence and are united in an essence that is numerically one—the highest mystery is the one whereby two complete natures* are joined together into the one person of the Son of God. Therefore the apostle calls the mystery that "God was made manifest in the flesh, the great mystery of godliness" (1 Timothy 3:16). 2

For this reason* also it cannot* be taught, or grasped, by human reasoning, because in the entire realm of nature* no example for it can be found that matches it perfectly and completely—although it does not conflict with sound reasoning. But it must be taught and shown* in a divine manner from Scripture, and it must be grasped with the eyes of faith. And herein lies the evidence that the teaching of God's Word* is exalted and obviously divine, and since it reveals and unfolds to us things about God and his economies* that surpass human reasoning, we must accept them with great confidence through faith in the testimony* of the God who bears the most truthful witness about himself. 3

1 Born in Gouda ca. 1598, Nicolaus Balbianus matriculated in theology on 11 May 1618. He defended this disputation in 1622. He was ordained in Bergambacht and Ammerstol in 1622 and in Leiden in 1643 and died in 1664; see Du Rieu, *Album studiosorum*, 136 and Van Lieburg, *Repertorium*, 13.

2 For the Law and Gospel see *SPT* 23, for predestination with respect to Christ *SPT* 24.24–25, 29, and to Christ's members *SPT* 24.26–28.

IV Est autem *Incarnatio* opus Dei, quo Filius Dei, secundum oeconomiam* divini consilii Patris et sui, et Spiritus Sancti, sese humilians, veram, integram, perfectam sanctamque carnem ex virgine Maria, Spiritus Sancti operatione et efficacia, in unitate personae* sibi assumsit: ita ut caro illa nullam propriam subsistentiam* extra Dei Filium habeat, sed ab illo et in eo vere sustentetur et gestetur; duabus perfectis naturis inter se ἀτρέπτως καὶ ἀσυγχύτως, ἀδιαιρέτως καὶ ἀχωρίστως unitis,[a] unde constituitur persona Christi Θεανθρώπου; hoc fine,* ut mediatoris partibus plene apud Deum fungi, homines Deo reconciliare atque unire posset, et electos Deo reconciliaret et uniret, justitiam, sanctitatem vitamque aeternam conferret, ad justitiae Dei demonstrationem et laudem misericordiae suae.

V Ad hujus theseos seu definitionis ἔκθεσιν, primum est σαρκώσεος et ἐνσαρκώσεος, seu incarnationis vox,* ex eo facta, quod *sermo ille dicitur factus caro*, Joh. 1, 14. Utuntur et Graeci ἐνανθρωπήσεως vocabulo, ex Epist. ad Philip. 2, 7. *factus in similitudine hominis*. Atque secundum hanc phraseologiam, Pater dicitur *misisse Filium in carnem*, Rom. 8, 3. et ipse *missus et venisse in carnem*, vel *carne* 1Joh. 4, 2. *formam servi accepisse*, Phil. 2, 7. *assumsisse semen Abrahae*, Heb. 2, 16. *et factus particeps carnis et sanguinis*. Item dicitur *habitare in Christo tota Deitas corporaliter*, Col. 2. *manifestatus in carne*, 1Tim. 3, 16. *habitu corporis compertus ut homo*, Phil. 2, 8.

VI Accepta porro *incarnationis* voce* active, est Dei opus; et quidem, ut omne opus et operatio Dei ad extra,* ut vocant, id est, quod relationem* extraneam a Deo habet, commune* est toti Trinitati, servato tamen ut in personis* divi-

[a] DH 150.

Well then, the incarnation is a work of God whereby the Son of God— 4
according to the economy* of the divine counsel of the Father, himself, and the Holy Spirit—humbled himself, and took upon himself in the unity of his person* true, whole, complete and sacred flesh from the virgin Mary, through the Holy Spirit's efficacious activity.[3] He did so in such a way that the flesh does not exist* on its own or apart from the Son of God, but it is maintained and borne by and in him. The two natures,* each in its entirety, were united with each other unaltered, unmixed, undivided and inseparate.[4] Out of these the person of Christ, the God-and-man, is constituted, and for this purpose:* that he could fully perform the tasks of the mediator before God, that he would reconcile men to God and unite them to him, and that he would reconcile the elect and unite them to God and would bestow on them righteousness, holiness, and eternal life, for the demonstration of God's justice and for the praise of his mercy.

In setting forth and defining this thesis, the first term* is *sarkōsis* (or *ensarkō-* 5
sis), that is 'incarnation,' which comes from John 1:14: "The word was made flesh." The Greeks also use the term *enanthrōposis* ['taking on the nature of man'], from the Letter to the Philippians 2:7, "made in the likeness of man."[5] And according to this wording, the Father is said "to have sent his Son in the flesh" (Romans 8:3),[6] and he himself "was sent and came in the flesh," or "by the flesh" (1John 4:2). "He received the form of a slave" (Philippians 2:7), "he took upon himself the offspring of Abraham" (Hebrews 2:16), and "he was made partaker of our flesh and blood." In the same way it says: "In Christ the full Godhead dwelled in bodily form" (Colossians 2[:9]), "manifested in the flesh" (1Timothy 3:16), "being found in human form as a man" (Philippians 2:8).

Well then, if we take the word* 'incarnation' in an active sense, it is the 6
work of God. In fact, like every work and activity that God performs, as they say, 'outside of himself'* (i.e., what has a relationship* external to God), it is common* to the whole Trinity.[7] However, the order and the rank [within the

3 On the one hand there is an anti-docetist element in this definition, emphasizing over against the Anabaptists that the Son of God assumed true flesh from Mary (see antithesis 3 below); on the other hand, this flesh is said to be perfect and sacred, not in the sense of the resurrected body, but probably to indicate that Christ was free of sin.

4 The Council of Chalcedon (451) affirmed the formula regarding Christ's two natures.

5 The term *enanthrōposis* does not occur in the Greek text of Philippians 2; the Greek fathers used both *sarkōsis* (made flesh) and *enanthrōposis* (made human) for the incarnation and Thysius claims that the second term is based on Philippians 2.

6 This is a paraphrase; Romans 8:3 reads "in the likeness of sinful flesh."

7 The rule according to which the workings of the Trinity *ad extra* are indivisible also applies to the incarnation. For the distinction between God's opera *ad intra* and *ad extra*; see *SPT* 6.36 and 9.8–13; cf. *PRRD* 4: 257–274.

nis, sic et in actionibus ordine ac subordinatione; ita ut *fons actionis* sit a Patre, adeoque referatur ad Patrem, *medium* in Filio, nempe sapientia Patris, *terminus** in Spiritu Sancto, utpote virtute et potentia Dei altissimi, per quem exterius profertur; idque intelligendum, tum ratione decreti, tum operis ipsius. Atqui termini illius respectu peculiariter Spiritui Sancto appropriatur, Matt. 1, 18. 20. Luc. 1, 35. unde in Symbolo dicitur *conceptus de Spiritu Sancto*.

VII *Opus* autem est *oeconomicum*,* id est, divinae voluntatis* gratiosa actio, certo et sapiente consilio, pro ratione ordinis et actionis peragendae, scilicet ad salutis nostrae reparationem, conveniente dispositione seu dispensatione* in personis* divinis facta, initum susceptumque; ita ut Pater mittentis, Filius missi et venientis in carnem et in mundum, Spiritus Sanctus efficientis et Filio corpus aptantis, partes singulariter teneat.

VIII Haec *oeconomia** relata ad Filium (quo nomine* veteribus Patribus ex Apostolo Eph. 1. Incarnatio appellatur) seu *Incarnatione passive et subjective* accepta, non Pater aut Spiritus Sanctus, sed solus Dei Filius incarnatus seu homo factus est, ut passim Scriptura testatur, Luc. 1, 35. Joh. 1, 14. Rom. 1, 3, Gal. 4, 4. Phil. 2. Quamvis secundum voluntatem* et beneplacitum s. s. Trinitatis sit incarnatus.

IX Proinde persona* Filii Dei, non natura,* quae tribus personis communis,* proprie* loquendo incarnata est, Joh. 1, 14. nisi naturam consideremus qua Filii est, singulari τῆς ὑπάρξεως τρόπῳ distincta. Non quod alia atque alia sit Deitas Patris et Spiritus Sancti, sed quod modo* habendi distincte consideretur,

Trinity] is kept in the case of the actions, as it is in the case of the divine persons.* It happens in such a way that the source of the action comes from the Father, and consequently relates to him. The means of the action lies in the Son, who is the "wisdom of the Father," while the outcome* is with the Holy Spirit, inasmuch as he is the strength and power* of God most high, through whom the action is carried out. And we should understand it in this way both regarding the decree and the work itself. And as far as the outcome of the incarnation is concerned, the word is used especially of the Holy Spirit (Matthew 1:18, 20; Luke 1:35); therefore in the Creed it says, "conceived by the Holy Spirit."

7 Moreover, the incarnation is a work of God's economy* of salvation. That is to say, it is a gracious act of the divine will,* following the sure and wise counsel befitting the order and action that is to be performed, namely for the restoration of our salvation begun and performed through a suitable arrangement (or dispensation*) made between the divine persons.* It is fitting that the Father takes on the specific roles of the one who sends, the Son of the one who is sent and who comes in the flesh and into the world, while the Holy Spirit takes on the tasks specific to the one who executes the action and prepares a body fit for the Son.

8 When this economy* (the name* which the early church fathers, following the apostle in Ephesians 1, gave to the incarnation) is in relation to the Son or when incarnation is taken in a passive and subjective sense, then it is not the Father or the Holy Spirit, but only the Son of God who became incarnate or was made man, as Scripture everywhere testifies (Luke 1:35; John 1:14; Romans 1:3; Galatians 4:4; Philippians 2[:7 and 8]). Nevertheless it was by the will* and good pleasure of the Holy Trinity that he became incarnate.

9 Accordingly, it is the person* of the Son of God, and not his nature* (which is common* to the three persons), that strictly* speaking became incarnate (John 1:14)—unless we consider the nature by which the Son is, as distinct by the unique manner of [his nature's] existence.[8] Not because it is different from the deity of the Father or the Holy Spirit, but because it is considered as different in the way* in which it is possessed [by the Son]: "God was manifested in the

8 The divine persons have one and the same nature ('deity'), but in each person it exists in a way proper and unique to that person; the divine nature can be said to differ in the persons only in the 'manner of its existence' [*tēs huparcheōs tropō*]. John of Damascus explains that though Christ's nature has a unique 'manner of existence' this "does not imply any difference in substance, nor any quality" and he compares that to the differences between Adam who was formed by God, Eve who was produced from his rib, and Seth who was begotten: they are all human beings, but differ in the manner of their existence. John of Damascus, *Expositio Fidei* 1.8. For the English translation see Frederic H. Chase, trans., *St. John of Damascus: Writings*, The Fathers of the Church 37 (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1958), 181.

1Tim. 3, 16. *Deus manifestatus est in carne*. Col. 2, 9. *In eo inhabitat omnis plenitudo Deitatis corporaliter*.

x *Filius* ergo *Dei*, qui ab aeterno fuit ὑφιστάμενος, Prov. 8, 22. 23. etc. ὁ λόγος, sermo qui *erat a principio*, qui *erat apud Deum*, et qui *erat Deus*, Joh. 1, 1. qui *erat antequam Abraham esset*, Joh. 8, 58. ὑπάρχων, *existens in forma Dei*, Phil. 2, 6. ille, inquam, Patri ὁμοούσιος, ἴσος καὶ συναΐδιος, coessentialis, aequalis et coaeternus, *factus est* in tempore *caro*, Joh. 1, 14.

xi *Caro cum factus* dicitur, non ejus phantasma, sed verum corpus, carne et ossibus et sanguine constans intelligitur, Matt. 14, 26. Luc. 24, 39. Hebr. 2, 14. Synecdochice* vero integer homo, corpore et anima rationali, partibus* essentialibus naturae* humanae, constitutus.

xii Quin *perfectus homo*, naturalibus,* et quidem essentialibus* proprietatibus, quae necessario et inseparabiliter ei insunt, praeditus; ut sunt totius quidem humanae naturae, quod creata et finita, alterius vero partis, puta animae, quod incorporea, invisibilis, impatibilis, intelligens, volens etc. corporis, quod quantitate et certis lineamentis constans, partemque extra partem habens, certa magnitudine circumscriptum, et quod qualitate* effigiatum, visibile et palpabile etc. sit, Luc. 24, 39. Joh. 20, 27. 1Joh. 1, 2.

xiii Accedunt *Accidentariae* proprietates*, quae separabiliter insunt, et mutari abolerique possunt; ut in anima, sapientiae incrementum, Esa. 7, 16. Luc. 2, 40. ejus passiones, ut tristitia usque ad mortem, Matt. 26, etc. In corpore, incrementum staturae, Luc. 2, 40. fames, sitis, esus, potus, lassitudo, somnus, dolores corporis, lacrymae, sudor sanguinis, etc. Matt. 4, 2. Joh. 4, 6. Matt. 11, 19. Matt. 8, 24. Luc. 19, 41. Luc. 22, 44.

xiv In summa, sub nomine* *carnis* non modo verus, integer et perfectus homo intelligitur, nobis ὁμοούσιος sed etiam *humilis, misera ac infirma hominis conditio* (quae tamen in eo pro ratione primi status duntaxat fuit ad tempus) comprehenditur; unde et *formam servi* accepisse, Phil. 2, 7. *factus ex domino servus*,

flesh" (1 Timothy 3:16); and "in him the whole fullness of the Godhead dwells bodily" (Colossians 2:9).

10 Therefore the Son of God, who has been in existence from eternity (Proverbs 8:22, 23, etc.)—"the word which was from the beginning, which was with God, and which was God" (John 1:1), "who was there before Abraham" (John 8:58), "existing in the form of God" (Philippians 2:6)—that Son, I say, though he is of the same substance, equal and co-eternal, in time was made flesh (John 1:14).

11 When it says that he was made flesh, it does not mean a phantom of him, but a real body, existing of flesh, bones, and blood (Matthew 14:26; Luke 24:39; Hebrews 2:14). By synecdoche*[9] this means that he was a whole man, made up of a physical body and a rational soul, the essential parts* of human nature.*

12 Indeed, he was a complete man, endowed with the natural* and also essential* properties, which are part of man in a necessary and inseparable way. Such properties belong to the whole human nature, namely that it is created and finite; or the properties belong to one part of [human nature,] i.e., the soul, namely that it is incorporeal, invisible, not capable of suffering physically, possessing intelligence and a will, etc. Or [the properties belong] to the other part [of human nature], i.e., the body, namely that it exists regarding quantity and by certain delineations; it has separate body-parts, is defined by a certain size, and regarding quality;* it has a shape, can be seen and touched (Luke 24:39; John 20:27; 1 John 1:2).[10]

13 And the parts of human nature happen to have accidental* properties which can be separated from it and which can be altered or even removed altogether. In the soul such qualities include: a measure of wisdom (Isaiah 7:16; Luke 2:40); its emotions, such as being sorrowful unto death (Matthew 26[:38], etc.). In the body: a measure of stature (Luke 2:40), hunger, thirst, eating, drinking, tiredness, sleep, bodily pain, tears, sweating blood, etc. (Matthew 4:2; John 4:6; Matthew 11:19; Matthew 8:24; Luke 19:41; Luke 22:44).

14 In short, the name* 'flesh' not only means a true, entire, and complete man, of the same substance as we are, but it also entails the humble, wretched, and weak human condition (which nevertheless was so in him [i.e. Christ] only for a time, because of his first state).[11] For this reason it is said that he took on "the form of a servant" (Philippians 2:7), that "from being Lord he was made servant"

---

9 See *SPT* 24.46.

10 In Aristotelian philosophy, 'quantity' and 'quality' are accidents that inhere in a substance; 'quantity' has to do with the abstract mathematical properties of the substance (in this case, the body), while 'quality' makes it perceptible to the senses.

11 This refers to Christ's state of humiliation as opposed to the state of exaltation; see *SPT* 27 and 28.

Joh. 13, 13. 14. ex *divite pauper*, 2 Cor. 8, 9. ὁμοιοπαθὴς, *similiter affectus*,* et *nobis per omnia similis*, Heb. 2, 17, et 4, 15. dicitur; quae quidem omnia lubens volensque subiit.

XV Talis ergo homo factus est Filius Dei; et quidem homo, quoad originem ex homine, ut noster frater esse posset, sc. non immediate* a Deo ut primus homo ex terra creatus, aut e coelo substantia* sua delapsus, sed ex uno eodemque sanguine Adami progenitus, Act. 17, 26. anima corpori ordinario modo increata et conjuncta unitaque. Unde et genealogiam ad Adamum ducit, Luc. 3, 38. *Filius hominis*, Matt. 8, 20. et 10, 23. et *Frater noster*, Heb. 2, 17. appellatur.

XVI Secundum promissionem autem, singulariter, *semen et Filius mulieris*, Gen. 3, 15. *Abrahami, in cujus semine benedicendae promittuntur omnes gentes*, Gen. 12, 3. et 22, 18. Gal. 3, 8. *Isaaci*, Gen. 26, 3. 4. *Jacobi*, Gen. 28, 14. Inde *Judae*, et *ex ejus tribu*, Gen. 49, 10. Heb. 7, 14. *Davidis*, 2 Sam. 7. adeoque *surculus et flos Jessae*, Esa. 11, 1. et *prognatus e lumbis Davidis*, Act. 2, 30. imo et *David*, propter originem et typum, vocatur.

XVII Verum peculiariter ejus genus ad *Abrahamum* et *Davidem*, ut genearchas, propter promissionem singulariter ipsis factam, refertur, Matt. 1, 1. Ac ab Abrahamo in Davidem per Solomonem *legaliter*, per Nathanem *naturaliter** ducitur, Matt. 1. Luc. 3. ut ita divina promissio suum complementum acciperet.

XVIII Veruntamen nomine* *carnis* non intelligitur, caro corrupta, qualiter fere accipitur Spiritui opposita, Joh. 3, 6. sed labis communis* exsors, Luc. 1, 35. Heb.

(John 13:13–17), that "though rich he became poor" (2 Corinthians 8:9), "having similar feelings"* *homoiopathēs*[12] and "like us in every respect" (Hebrews 2:17, and 4:15). All of these things he underwent readily and willingly.

It was such a man that the Son of God became; a man indeed, inasmuch 15
as he was born of man, that he might be a brother to us. That is to say, he was not created directly* by God, as the first man was, from the earth. Nor did he descend from heaven in his own essence,* but he was brought forth from the self-same blood of Adam (Acts 17:26), while his soul was fashioned in his body in the normal manner,[13] and joined and united with it. For this reason he traces also his genealogy from Adam (Luke 3:38). He is called "the Son of Man" (Matthew 8:20, and 10:23), and "our brother" (Hebrews 2:17).

From the perspective of the promise, however, he is separately called "seed 16
and son of the woman" (Genesis 3:15), "of Abraham, in whose offspring all the nations receive the promise of future blessing" (Genesis 12:3; 22:18; Galatians 3:18), "of Isaac" (Genesis 26:3 and 4), "of Jacob" (Genesis 28:14). And then "of Judah," and "from his tribe" (Genesis 49:10; Hebrews 7:14), "of David" (2 Samuel 7), and so "shoot and flower of Jesse" (Isaiah 11:1), and "sprung from the loins of David" (Acts 2:30), and even simply "David" since he was descended from him and prefigured by him.

But his descent is traced particularly to Abraham and David as his ancestors, 17
since the promise had been made especially to them (Matthew 1:1). And his descent is traced from Abraham to David through Solomon according to the law, and through Nathan by nature* (Matthew 1[:1–17]; Luke 3[:23–38]),[14] so that in this way the divine promise might reach its fulfillment.

But the word* 'flesh' does not mean 'flesh that has been corrupted,' in the 18
sense that one normally understands it to be the opposite of the Spirit (John 3:6), but it does not share in the universal* fall into sin (Luke 1:35; Hebrews 4:15).

---

12 This Greek word is used for Elijah in James 5:17 and for Paul and Barnabas in Acts 14:15.

13 Thysius does not explain what that normal manner was, but in the discussion of 'traducianism' and 'creatianism' in *SPT* 13.52–53 he expresses his preference for the view that God creates each soul individually.

14 Thysius might be referring to a traditional explanation—mentioned already by Julius Africanus around AD 200—of the differences between the genealogies of Jesus in Matthew 1 and Luke 3. Jacob, who is Joseph's father according to Matthew, and Eli, Joseph's father in the Lucan genealogy, were half-brothers. They had the same mother, a woman called Estha, but two different fathers: Jacob's father came from the line of David's son Solomon (in Matthew) and Eli's father was a descendant from David's son Nathan (in Luke). When Eli died without issue, Jacob married his widow in accordance with the law on the Levirate marriage. He then had a son with her, Joseph, who by nature was his son, but by law was accounted son of Eli.

4, 15. Non enim conveniebat humanam naturam* peccato obnoxiam Filio Dei uniri. Quamvis *venit in similitudine carnis peccati*, seu peccato obnoxiae, Rom. 8, 3. ut cujus vestigia in fragilitate gessit.

XIX Quare etiam non *ex sanguinibus, aut libidine carnis aut viri*, id est, ratione seminali, sed sine interventu viri, vi Spiritus Sancti, *ex muliere* (*cujus semen* dicitur Gen. 3.) et *virgine*, Esa. 7. progignendus praedicitur. Et nominatim ex *muliere virgine beata Maria*, desponsata quidem Josepho, ad famam, salutem et curam ejus, Matt. 1, 19. 20. sed ab eo non cognita, v. 25. ex cujus substantia* progenitus est, Gal. 4, 4. Matt. 1, 18. 20, cujus ipse *ventris fructus*, Luc. 1, 42. et ipsa *ejus mater*, et ille, *hujus Filius*, et quidem *primogenitus*, dicitur. Adeoque ut secundum divinitatem ἀμήτωρ, *sine matre*, ita secundum humanitatem ἀπάτωρ, *sine patre*, declaretur, Heb. 7, 3.

XX *Supernaturaliter** itaque *conceptus est*, scilicet *ex Spiritu Sancto*, id est, vi ejus immediate* operante, qui in et ex virgine Maria sanguinem et semen decerptum, atque utero conceptum fecundavit, ut ineptum alias, aptum semen foret generationi; ac proinde ejus respectu singulariter non genitus sed *factus* dicitur, Rom. 1, 3. Gal. 4, 4. Atque illud insuper ab omni labe et immunditia, quae, ut in ceteris hominibus, ita et Maria fuit, Job. 4, 4. Ps. 51, 7. mundavit et sanctificavit, et sanctum porro conservavit; ideoque, *quod in ea genitum, sanctum* dicitur, Luc. 1, 35.

XXI Atque hujus conceptionis *supernaturalis** modi* et efficientiae Spiritus Sancti respectu, *prior* et *posterior* Adam seu homo, ut qui singularis homo, suo quodam modo conferuntur et opponuntur: et ille ex terra factus, et hic de coelo descendisse dicitur, scilicet, non quoad corporis materiam, sed conceptionis modum,* Rom. 5, 14. 1 Cor. 15, 45. 47. Joh. 3, 13. et 6, 41. etc.

For it was not fitting that the human nature* that is subject to sin be united with the Son of God. And yet "he came in the likeness of sinful flesh," or [of flesh] subject to sin (Romans 8:3), as he bore the traces of it in his weakness.

For this reason it is proclaimed that he would be born "not of blood, nor of 19
the will of the flesh or of man" [John 1:13] (that is, by way of a man's semen), but without a man's intercourse, by the power of the Holy Spirit, "from a woman" ("whose seed" he is called, Genesis 3[:15]) and "from a virgin" (Isaiah 7[:14]). And expressly from a woman, the blessed virgin Mary, who was engaged to be married to a certain Joseph for her good reputation, her wellbeing, and her care (Matthew 1:19–20)—a man who had no carnal knowledge of her (Matthew 1:25). It says that he was born of her substance* (Galatians 4:4; Matthew 1:18 and 20), he is the "fruit of her womb" (Luke 1:42); she is "his mother" while he is "her son," even "her first-born son." And just as he was *amētōr*, 'without mother,' according to his divine nature, it is declared that he was *apatōr*, 'without father,' according to his human nature (Hebrews 7:3).

And so it was beyond the natural* way of things that "he was conceived," i.e., 20
"from the Holy Spirit," by the direct* working of his power, as he made fruitful the blood and seed that was gathered in and of the virgin Mary and conceived in her womb, in order to turn seed that was otherwise ill-suited into seed suitable for generation.[15] In this regard, therefore, it is particularly said not that he was begotten, but made (Romans 1:3; Galatians 4:4). And moreover [the Spirit] took what was conceived and cleansed it from every blemish and uncleanness that was in Mary as it is in all people, and he made it holy, and further kept it holy (Job 14:4, Psalm 51:7). And so, "that which is conceived in her is called holy" (Luke 1:35).

And as far as the supernatural* mode* of this conception is concerned, and 21
the Holy Spirit's efficacy in it, the "first Adam" is compared and contrasted in some way to the "second Adam" (or "second man") insofar as he is a unique man. For the former is said to have been made from the earth, while the latter descended from heaven. In other words, [the comparison is] not in the substance of body but in the way* in which they are conceived (Romans 5:14; 1 Corinthians 15:45, 47; John 3:13 and 6:41, etc.).

15 The most popular theory of procreation in the sixteenth century was Galen's view, modified by certain Aristotelian elements. Generation was thought to be the result of a mixture of male semen, less active female semen and menstrual blood. See: Evelyne Berroit-Salvadore, "The discourse of medicine and science," in *A History of Women in the West: Renaissance and Enlightenment Paradoxes*, ed.: G. Duby, M. Perrot, N. Zemon-Davis, and P. Schmitt-Panel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 3:364–365.

XXII At quoad cetera, *naturaliter*,* seu consueto naturae ordine in utero Virginis Mariae conformatus, fotus, altus, novem gestatus mensibus, opportuno partus tempore, naturae* repagulis reseratis, seu aperto utero, natus editusque, ac inde nutritus educatusque est, Es. 7, 14. 15. Luc. 1, 56. et 2, 6. 23. 40. 42. 52. et 11, 27.

XXIII Natus est autem homo, tempore et loco a Deo designato, idque tempore opportuno, *novissimo* scilicet *mundi tempore*, Es. 2. atque *adveniente ejus plenitudine*, Gal. 4, 4. *Sceptro a Juda ablato*, utpote Augusto Judaeis imperante, Genes. 49, 10. Luc. 2. *sub finem* 70. *Hebdomadarum* a Daniele praedictarum, Dan. 9 atque in *Judaea*, civitate Davidis Bethlehem, Mich. 5, 1. Matt. 2, 1. 5. Luc. 2, 4.

XXIV *Modus** porro quo Filius Dei unigenitus factus est caro, est per *immediatam** *unionem personae* Filii Dei* ad humanam naturam,* seu *assumptionem humanae naturae*, in unam eandemque personam, Phil. 2, 7. Hebr. 2, 16. Ita ut Filius Dei secunda s. s. Trinitatis aeterna persona, non personam praeexsistentem; sed ἀνυπόστατον propriae hypostaseos* seu subsistentiae* expertem, jam inde a conceptionis momento assumpserit in personae unitatem, eamque sibi propriam effecerit, adeoque caro illa extra Filium Dei subsistentiam non habeat, sed in eo exsistat, subsistat et ab eo gestetur et sustentetur.

XXV Unde revera *Filius Dei Filius hominis esse coepit*, manendo quod erat, et incipiendo esse quod non erat, non quod ei quicquam ad perfectionem* accesserit: et *Filius hominis Filius Dei factus est*, scilicet quod Filius Dei erat per naturam,* id Filius hominis factus est per unionis gratiam.* Atque hinc Maria *Mater Domini*, Luc. 1, 35. et Veteribus θεοτόκος, *Deipara* appellatur.

But as for the other aspects of his incarnation, he was formed in a natural* 22
way, or according to the usual order of nature, in the womb of the virgin Mary, nurtured, nourished, and carried for nine months. And when the right time came for birth, and nature's* restraints were set free and the womb was opened, then he was born and brought forth; and thereupon he was nursed and reared (Isaiah 7:14, 15; Luke 1:56 and 2:6, 23, 40, 42 and 11:27).

And so he was born man, at a time and place chosen by God, and when the 23
time was right, i.e., "at the very last time of the world" (Isaiah 2[:2]), "when the fullness of time had come" (Galatians 4:4), "when the scepter had departed from Judah"—that is, when Augustus was ruler over the Jews (Genesis 49:10; Luke 2[:1])—towards the end of the seventy weeks that Daniel had foretold (Daniel 9), and "in Judea, in the city of David, Bethlehem" (Micah 5:1; Matthew 2:1, 5; Luke 2:4).

The manner* whereby the only-begotten Son of God became flesh is through 24
the direct* union of the person* of God's Son with human nature,* or through the assumption of human nature in one and the same person* (Philippians 2:7; Hebrews 2:16). It so happened that the Son of God, as the second eternal person of the Holy Trinity, did not take on himself a pre-existing person, but from the moment of conception he assumed something 'an-hypostatic,' that is, something without a proper hypostasis* or subsistence.*[16] He assumed it [i.e., human nature or flesh] into the union of his person, and caused it to be his own; so that flesh has no subsistence apart from the Son of God, but it exists and subsists in him, and by him it is borne and sustained.

And thus the Son of God commenced to be the Son of Man, remaining what 25
he was and undertaking to be what he was not[17]—but not that anything had to be added to make him complete.* Meanwhile, the Son of Man became the Son of God; i.e., what the Son of God was by nature* that is what the Son of Man became, by the grace* of union. And for this reason Mary is called the "mother of the Lord," Luke 1:35, while the ancients called her *theotokos*, bearer-of-God.[18]

---

16 The Greek word *anhypostasis* means that the human nature, which the Son of God assumed, does not subsist on its own; it does not constitute a person. There is no human person before or independent from the incarnation, but it is dependent on the hypostatic union, whereas in mortal beings human nature always constitutes an independent hypostasis. The doctrine of *anhypostasis* aims at excluding Adoptianism, the view that the Son of God assumed a human person which was already in existence. See *DLGTT* s.v. 'anhypostasis.'

17 Around AD 360 Hilary of Poitiers coined the well-known phrase that the Son of God becoming the Son of Man did not lose what he was but began to be what he was not (*De Trinitate* 3.16). See *CCSL* 62:87.

18 On the controversy between Cyril of Alexandria and Nestorius who suggested 'bearer-of-

XXVI Cum hac unione immediata* personae* assumentis, et naturae* assumptae cohaeret, ut ejus proprietas, *naturarum inter se unio seu unitio*; qua duae perfectae naturae, divina et humana, non naturaliter* in unam naturam, id est, essentiam* et essentiales proprietates, sed hypostatice, id est, mediante Filii Dei hypostasi,* in unam personam inter se unitae sunt. Quae hypostasis ex divina et humana natura ita constituta, non autem composita, *Christus, Emanuel*, seu θεάνθρωπος, *Deus homo* appellatur.

XXVII Haec autem duarum *naturarum** (non naturalis*) *personalis** (non personarum*) *unio*, facta est primo ἀσυγχύτως et ἀτρέπτως, *inconfuse et immutabiliter*; ita ut duae naturae,* earumque essentiales* proprietates et actiones, inter se non confundantur, neque una cum altera misceatur, aut una in alteram mutetur, aut quomodolibet aboleantur, id est, neque Deus in hominem, neque homo in Deum mutetur, aut homo a Deo absorbeatur, aut ex homine et Deo tertia componatur; sed salvae et integrae maneant, ita ut in Christo duplex sit natura, adeoque et facultates,* sapientia et scientia,* voluntas,* potentia,* actio et operatio, divina scilicet et humana, Joh. 2, 24. 25. Marc. 13, 32. Luc. 2, 52. Joh. 10, 30. Luc. 22, 42. Est enim in Christo ἄλλο καὶ ἄλλο, *aliud et aliud*.

XXVIII Deinde ἀδιαιρέτως καί ἀχωρίστως, *indivise et inseparabiliter*, ita ut una natura* ab altera re ipsa non dividatur aut separetur (quod enim semel assumpsit et sibi univit, nunquam aut usquam, ne in morte quidem, dimittet) sed utraque in persona* in perpetuum unita maneat, adeoque duo Christi non constituan-

---

Christ' (*christotokos*) instead of 'bearer-of-God,' see *SPT* 19.30, note 44. Nestorius is also mentioned in antithesis 4.i below.

The mutual union (or unity) of the natures* is closely linked to this direct* union of the person* who assumes and the nature that is assumed, as a property that belongs to it [i.e., to this latter union]. Hereby two entire natures, the divine and the human one, are mutually united, but not naturally* in one nature, that is not in one essence* and its essential properties. This union occurs into one person hypostatically, i.e., through the mediating action of the hypostasis* of the Son of God. This hypostasis, thus having been constituted (but not compounded) of the divine and the human nature, is called the Christ, Emmanuel, or the God-and-man (*theanthrōpos*). 26

This is a personal* union (though not a union of persons*), a union of two natures* (though not a natural* union),[19] and it came about 'without confusion (*asugchytōs*) and without change (*atreptōs*).'[20] It was made in such a way that the two natures,* along with their essential* properties and actions, were not mutually confused, nor was the one mixed in with the other, nor was the one turned into the other, nor were they somehow destroyed. That is, God was not changed into man, nor was man changed into God; and man was not swallowed up in God, nor was a third person made up from man and God. But each remained whole and unchanged, so much so that there is a two-fold nature in Christ, and divine as well as human faculties,* wisdom and knowledge,* will,* power,* action and activity (John 2:24–25; Mark 13:32; Luke 2:52; John 10:30; Luke 22:42). For in Christ there exists *allo kai allo*, one thing as well as another. 27

The personal union also occurred 'without division (*adiairetōs*) and without separation (*achōristōs*),' in such a way that the one nature* is not actually divided or segregated from the other (for at no time or place, not even in death, does he lose what once he had taken up and joined to himself). But both natures forever remain so united in the person* that there is no formation of two Christs, of which the one is the Son of God and the other Mary's son, but 28

19 Thysius appears to wish to avoid the implication of Cyril's notion of "natural union" which could be interpreted as going too far in the direction of a concurrence in union out of two natures, even a 'mingling' of characteristics which were specific and proper to each nature. See, "Cyril's Letter to the monks of Egypt" as well as the "First Letter to Succensus," and McGuckin's commentary, in *St. Cyril of Alexandria* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 135, 231, 252, 355. It is difficult to determine the exact source of the phrase *unio naturarum, sed non naturalis, personalis sed non personarum*, but it is also found in Lutheran authors as a summary of the orthodox position. See Johann Gerhard, *Loci theologici* (Berlin: Schlawitz, 1863–1885), 1:501 and Conrad Dieterich, *Institutiones catecheticae* (Gießen: Casparis Chemlini, 1623), 325.

20 See thesis 4 above.

tur, quorum unus sit Dei, alter Mariae filius, sed unus sit Dei Filius in carne manifestatus. In Christo enim non est ἄλλος καὶ ἄλλος, *alius et alius*.

XXIX Ex unione porro consequitur *naturarum* κοινωνία, communio*, ut illius affectio ab illa dependens eique respondens. Ut enim duae naturae et earum proprietates vere et realiter, mediante persona,* inter se uniuntur, ita una cum altera communionem et societatem habet, atque ita, ut unio, ita et communio realis est. Et sane tam haec conjuncta sunt, ut μετοχὴ, *communio*, pro unione veteribus non raro ponatur, ex Epist. ad Hebr. 2, 14.

XXX Quare ὁ λόγος persona* assumens, non modo humanae naturae* assumptae, *unionis gratia,** gratis id dedit, ut in eo subsisteret; sed et virtutis suae efficacia, ad tanti muneris exsecutionem, Spiritum ac spiritualia et excellentia dona, eaque sine mensura, revera effudit et communicavit, Esa. 11, 1. 2. 3. Joh. 3, 34. Luc. 2, 52. Ita ut in Christo homine, subjective et habitualiter (ut loquuntur) insint. *Unde et habitualis haec gratia** dicitur. Quae quidem dona, ut sint φυσικὰ, *naturalia** et ὑπερφυσικὰ, *supernaturalia*,* quibus natura* perficitur, non tamen ἀντιφυσικὰ, *contra naturam*,* quibus aboletur.

XXXI Quin in *actibus officii*, et quae cum eo cohaerent, (quae competunt Christo secundum utramque naturam*) una natura* *communicat et agit cum com-*

there is one Son of God manifested in the flesh. For in Christ there does not exist *allos kai allos*, one person as well as another.[21]

From this union there arises a communion (*koinōnia*) of natures,* so that 29
the disposition of one nature depends on and corresponds to the other. For just as the two natures* and their properties are truly and really united with each other through the person* who mediates them, so also does the one nature have communion and fellowship with the other, so that the communion is real also, like the union. To be sure, these are so closely connected that the ancients, following the Letter to the Hebrews 2:14, frequently put 'communion' (*metochē*) for 'union.'[22]

Therefore, for the sake of the union, "the Word," the assuming person,* 30
freely granted the assumed human nature* to exist in it, by the grace* of union. But also, to carry out such a great task, by the efficacy of its power, the Word truly shared with it the Spirit, and the spiritual and excellent gifts, without measure (Isaiah 11:1–3; John 3:34; Luke 2:52). As a result, in the man Christ these things reside subjectively and habitually (so to speak). Therefore, this grace* is also called 'habitual.' These gifts, however, as they are natural* (*physika*) and supernatural* (*huperphysika*), by which nature* is perfected are not contrary to nature* (*antiphysika*), in which case it would be destroyed.[23]

In performing the duties of his office and all the things that go with it (the 31
things that apply to Christ with respect to both natures*) the one nature* shares

---

21 Cf. Gregory of Nazianzus, *Epistulae* 101.20 (SC 208: 45): "If I must state it briefly: there is one thing and another thing (*allo kai allo*) from out of which is the Savior … but there is not one [person] alongside another person (*allos kai allos*)." For the English translation see "St. Gregory Nazianzen's Letter to Cledonius," *St. Cyril of Alexandria*, ed. and trans. John A. McGuckin (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 391–392. The neuter gender *allo* refers to a thing—here the nature—and the masculine gender *allos* refers to a person. Gregory wrote this letter around 383–384 to Cledonius, the priest of the church at Nazianz, at the end of or right after the First Council of Constantinople (381). In the same passage, he also rejects the so-called "Two Sons Theory," which anticipated the view of Nestorius, to be censured at the Council of Ephesus (431). The expression *kat' allo kai allo* is also found in the records of the Second Council of Constantinople (NPNF2 14:345).

22 Hebrews 2:14 uses the verb *koinōneō* 'to enter into fellowship' to denote that the Son of God shared in the flesh and blood of the children of Abraham; this is interpreted as accepting the human nature in the unity of one person.

23 Cf. Thomas Aquinas: "Grace does not destroy nature, but perfects it," *Summa theologiae* 1.1.8. 'Habitual grace' is the scholastic term for the created gift of grace in human beings, a kind of supernatural quality infused by God through justification. Thysius's stipulation that nothing can be attributed to Christ's humanity that is *contrary* to human nature seems to be an anti-Lutheran polemic. Cf. the *Formula of Concord*, 8.3, 53.

munione alterius, salvis nempe naturae* cuique suis proprietatibus et agendi ordine; ut sint ἐνέργειαι, *operationes* cuique suae, sed ἀποτέλεσμα, *opus perfectum*, unum θεανδρικὸν, *Dei virile*. Sic servator, mediator, caput Ecclesiae, etc. est secundum utramque naturam.*

XXXII Atque hinc oritur *Phraseologia* rei* ipsi respondens: eaque est vel propria vel impropria. *Propria* est, qua naturae* alterutri, illud quod illius est, discretis vocibus* (quibus naturae per se sigillatim significantur*) vel personae,* sive ab altera natura denominatae, ejusdem proprietas vel actio in concreto (quo natura cum persona connotatur) tribuitur: ut *ὁ λόγος erat in principio, erat apud Patrem, erat Deus, per eum omnia condita sunt*, Joh. 1. *Puer natus est nobis*, Esa. 9. *Filius hominis traditur in manus peccatorum, crucifigitur et resurgit*, Matt. 17, 12. et 20, 19. et 26, 2. etc.

XXXIII Similiter *propria* est, cum personae* ab utraque natura* denominatae, id quod utriusque, seu commune* utrique naturae est, attribuitur, ita ut praedicatum* subjecto* sit aequale, qualia sunt ea quae officium vel statum ejus denotant, utpote Christus est Servator, Propheta, Sacerdos, Rex Ecclesiae suae, etc. Quae omnia καθ' ἑαυτὸ praedicantur.*

XXXIV *Impropria* vero est, cum qua personae* ab altera natura* denominatae. proprietas utrique communis,* vel vicissim ab utraque proprietas vel actio alterius naturae, quin et contraria in concreto attribuuntur. Quae quidem *Synecdo-*

and behaves in consort with the other nature* (except that each nature's* special properties and order of conduct are unaffected). Thus while each nature* has its own operations (*energeiai*), the work that is completed by them (*apotelesma*) is a work of the one 'God-and-man' (*theandrikos*) Thus it is according to both natures that he is the Savior, Mediator, Head of the Church, etc.[24]

And the phraseology that arises in relation to this subject-matter* is either 32
'proper' or 'improper.' Proper phraseology is when that which belongs only to one of the two natures* is attributed to that nature by different words* (used for signifying* each nature on its own). Proper phraseology occurs also when to the person,* or to what is denominated from either nature, is attributed a property or action of that same nature by a concrete term (which connotes the nature together with the person).[25] Such as: "The Word was in the beginning, it was with the Father, it was God, through whom all things were made" (John 1[:1–3]); "unto us a child is born" (Isaiah 9[:5]); "the Son of Man is handed over to the hands of sinners, he is crucified and he is raised" (Matthew 17:12; 20:19, and 26:2).

The phraseology is similarly 'proper' when that which belongs to both 33
natures* (or is shared* by them) is attributed to the person* as denominated from both natures, so that the predicate is equal to the subject.* Such words are those that indicate the office or status of the person, such as, Christ is the Savior, Prophet, Priest, King of his Church, etc. All such predications* are made in the strict and proper sense.[26]

On the other hand, 'improper phraseology' occurs when a property that is 34
common* to both natures* is attributed* to the person* denominated from [only] one of the two natures; or, on the other hand, when the property or

24 On the communication of mediatorial operations see *DLGTT* s.v. "communicatio idiomatum / communicatio proprietatum," "communicatio operationum." The two natures of the God-and-man work each in a distinct, yet inseparable manner for the sake of the work of salvation. See also *SPT* 26.18.

25 In the example "The Word was God," the predicate 'God' (which signifies the divine nature) is attributed to the subject 'the Word,' which also signifies the divine nature, but in different words. And in "a child is born," the concrete predicate 'born,' which signifies primarily the action of 'birth' and connotes secondarily an individual person who happens to undergo that action, is attributed to the subject 'child,' which signifies in this case the one person of Christ, but denominated from his human nature.

26 In this example, the predicates of 'Savior' and the like (which belong both to the divine and the human nature; cf. thesis 31) are attributed to the subject 'Christ,' which denominates the one person from both the divine and the human nature; cf. thesis 26 above.

chica locutio est*; unde et distinctiva particula aliqua expresse addita, vel subintellecta, inaequalis attributio* indicatur, ut, *Christus ex Israëlitis est, secundum carnem*, Rom. 9. *Ex lumbis Davidis τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, quantum ad carnem*, Act. 2. *Passus est, mortificatus est carne, vivificatus est Spiritu*, 1 Pet. 3. et 4. 2 Cor. 13. etc. *Item Christus Filius est Davidis, Christus Dominus est Davidis*, Matt. 22, 42. etc. Unde vulgata Theologis distinctio, inter *totum Christum et totum Christi*, seu Christum ὅλον et ὅλως, *totum* et *totaliter*.

XXXV *Tum qua de persona,** ab alterutra natura* appellata, praedicatum* alterius naturae propter personae unitatem in concreto enunciatur, ut personae

action of [only] one of the two natures (even the opposite property or action) is attributed* concretely to a person denominated from both natures.[27] This improper phraseology is a synecdochical* manner of speaking;[28] and that is why, by means of some distinguishing particle that has been expressly added or implied, an attribution* is indicated that is not equal, such as: "Christ is from the Israelites," "according to the flesh" (Romans 9[:3]), "from the loins of David," "as far as the flesh is concerned" (Acts 2[:30]), "he suffered, was put to death in the body, made alive in the Spirit" (1 Peter 3[:18], and 4[:2]; 2 Corinthians 13[:4], etc.). Likewise "Christ is the Son of David, Christ is David's Lord" (Matthew 22:42, etc.).[29] For this reason theologians make the common distinction between 'the whole Christ' and 'the whole of Christ,' or Christ *holon* and *holōs*, 'whole' and 'wholly.' [30]

Improper phraseology occurs also when a predicate* of one nature* is concretely said of the person* named from the other nature, by reason of the 35

27 The structure of theses 34–38 is as follows: thesis 34 concerns the two natures and the one person of Christ, thesis 35 the correspondence of the one nature with the other; thesis 36 deals with ancient terminology; thesis 37 concerns 'real' versus 'verbal': the former refers to the concept of 'person' on the level of individual reality (as proper to it), the latter refers to 'the whole'; and thesis 38 says that only because of the one person of Christ, one can say something of one nature or the other.

28 See *SPT* 24.46.

29 In these examples, a predicate that belongs only to the human nature (e.g., "from the Israelites") is attributed to the subject "Christ," which denominates the one person from both natures. Thysius does not give an example of the first case mentioned in this thesis, namely, "a property common to both natures" being attributed to "the person denominated from one nature." Such an example would be: "The Son of God is Savior." In the second case, additions like "according to the flesh" indicate that the predication is on the basis of only the human nature. Likewise, the addition "according to his divinity" would indicate a predication on the basis of only the divine nature.

30 For the distinction between "the whole Christ" and "Christ wholly" see Andrew McGinnis, *The Son of God Beyond the Flesh: A Historical and Theological Study of the Extra Calvinisticum* (London, New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2014), 59–70. The distinction was first used by John of Damascus and was adopted in scholastic theology. "Whole" in "the whole Christ" (*totus*, masculine adjective) refers to the person, while in "the whole of Christ" (neuter nominal adjective *totum*) it refers to either nature, as does the adverb "wholly" (*totaliter*). On the basis of this distinction, one could then say that the whole Christ is omnipresent, but not that the whole of Christ is omnipresent or that he is wholly omnipresent, because his (finite) human nature is not omnipresent and omnipresence belongs exclusively to the divine nature. See further, Willem J. van Asselt and Gert van den Brink, eds., *Scholastic Discourse: Johannes Maccovius (1588–1644) on Theological and Philosophical Distinctions and Rules* (Apeldoorn: Instituut voor Reformatieonderzoek, 2009), 350–351.

a divina natura, humana omnia. Utpote, *Filius Dei factus ex sanguine Davidis secundum carnem*, Rom. 1. *Dominus gloriae crucifixus*. 1Cor. 2. *Deus redemit Ecclesiam suo sanguine*, Act. 20. etc. vel ab humana, divina omnia, ut, *Filius hominis descendens de coelo est in coelo*, Joh. 3, 13, et 6, 62. *Dominus est e coelo*, 1Cor. 15. Ps. 47. quae omnia κατ᾽ ἄλλο καὶ ἄλλο intelligenda sunt.

XXXVI Haec porro enunciandi ratio variis appellationibus a veteribus appellatur, nempe nominum* ἐναλλαγὴ, *alternatio*; ἀλλοίωσις, *permutatio*; ἐπίζευξις, *conjunctio*; κοινότης seu κοινωνία, *communio, et ἀντίδοσις* seu *τρόπος ἀντιδόσεως, mutua positio*, seu *modus positionis unius pro altero*. Cassianus[a] *Synecdochen** vocat, et quidem duplicata Synecdoche est, in subjecto* primum, inde praedicato.* Scholastici,* *Communicationem idiomatum*, seu *proprietatum*, vocant.

XXXVII Quod quidem genus* enunciationis, in persona* reale est et proprium, ut summa illa duarum in uno Christo naturarum* conjunctio significetur,* in natura* seorsim considerata ne verbale quidem; at vero de persona,* cum respectu naturae* verbale, id est, pertinens ad phraseos explicationem, improprium, aut ut alii volunt, inusitatum est.

XXXVIII *Huic autem vicinum est illud*, quo personae* tribuitur, quod ei per se secundum neutram naturam* convenit, sed cum σχέσει ad alteram naturam:* ita *Filius Dei*, aut *Filius hominis descendisse* dicitur *de coelo*, Joh. 3. et 6. et *Dominus e coelo*, 1Cor. 15., quod primo ac primario respectu unionis hypostaticae* intel-

[a] See Cassian, *De incarnatione Domini contra Nestorium* 6.23 (CSEL 17:349–351).

unity of the person, as when all human things are said of the person named from the divine nature. Such as: "The Son of God was made from the blood of David according to the flesh" (Romans 1[:3]); "the God of glory was crucified" (1 Corinthians 2[:2]); "God redeemed the Church with his own blood" (Acts 20[:28]), etc. The same happens when all the divine things are said [of the person named] from the human nature, such as "the Son of Man descending from the heaven is in heaven" (John 3:13 and 6:62); "The Lord is from heaven" (1 Corinthians 15[:47]; Psalm 47).[31] All these things should be understood according to one or the other nature.[32]

The ancients have given different names* to this manner of speaking. The 36
terms are as follows: *enallage* ('interchange'), *alloiōsis* ('alteration'), *epizeuxis* ('conjunction'), *koinotēs* or *koinōnia* ('association'), and *antidosis* or *tropos antidoseōs* ('mutual placing of a word' or 'the device of putting one instead of the other'). Cassian calls it synecdoche* and also a double synecdoche—first in the subject* and then in the predicate.* The Scholastics* call it 'a communication of idioms or properties' (*communicatio idiomatum*).[33]

To be sure, this kind* of speech is real in the person* and proper to him, in 37
order to indicate* the closest connection of the two natures* in the one Christ; but in the separately considered nature* it isn't even a verbal kind of speech. And yet concerning the person,* with respect to nature,* the verbal kind of speech (the kind that pertains to an explanation of the wording) is improper, or as some prefer to call it, unusual.

Something close to this occurs when an attribute is bestowed on the person* 38
that in itself does not match him according to either of the two natures,* but only with relation to the other nature.* In this way it says: "The Son of God," or "the Son of Man descended from heaven" (John 3[:13] and 6[:33, 38, 41, 42, 50, 51, and 58]), and "the Lord from heaven" (1 Corinthians 15[:47]). This must first and

31 In these examples, the subject-term, which denotes Christ, is taken from one nature—either the divine nature, as in "Son of God" and "God" or the human nature as in "Son of Man" or "Lord"—while the predicate is taken from the other nature.

32 On the Greek expression *kat' allo kai allo* see also theses 26–28 above, and note 21.

33 For Cyril of Alexandria, and later, for Chalcedon orthodoxy, the basis of this method of a communication or exchange of properties was the single subjectivity or person of the God-and-man, which, according to Nestorius, confused the issue of the distinctness of the two natures. See John A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria: The Christological Controversy* (New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2004), 153. Lutherans and Calvinists disagreed over the doctrine of the "communication of properties," in particular in relation to the Eucharist. The Lutherans accused the Calvinists of the heresy of Nestorius, who had separated the two natures, while the Calvinists claimed that the Lutherans adopted the monophysite heresy of Eutyches, who had confused both natures in Christ.

ligendum est, *exinanitus et exaltatus, Christo data omnis potestas in coelo et in terra*, Matt. 28. Quod enim habet Filius Dei ab aeterno, id datum Filio hominis, et accepisse in tempore intelligitur.

XXXIX Atque ex his, humanae scilicet naturae* a Filio Dei assumptione, utriusque naturae unione et communione, ac denique respondente phraseologia, *discrimen quod est inter Christum hominem et reliquos*, etiam sanctissimos, apparet; *In ipso enim inhabitat omnis plenitudo Deitatis σωματικῶς*, Col. 2. Filius enim hominis Filius Dei est, et quicquid est Filii hominis Filii Dei est.

XL *Finis** denique incarnationis, est officii sibi a Patre impositi praestatio, et salutis nostrae procuratio, Es. 9, 6. Luc. 2, 7. *Homo, et quidem verus homo* esse debuit, ut vera homini, qui peccaverat, per hominem praestaretur salus. *Totus et integer, scilicet* anima et corpore, et eorum essentialibus* proprietatibus constans, ut totus homo, et corpore, et imprimis anima repararetur. *Humilis ac fragilis et mortalis*, ut pati, sanguinem effundere, et mori (sine quo non est redemptio, et in quo redemptionis est pretium) posset.* *Homo ex homine*, seu filius hominis, ne aliena natura* lueret. *Ex virgine* supernaturaliter* vi Spiritus Sancti factus et sanctificatus, ut singularis et segregatus a peccato, tollere peccatum et salvare nos posset,* Es. 53. Matt. 1, 21. 23. Hebr. 2, 9. 14. 16. et 7, 26. etc.

XLI *Filium Dei* esse oportuit, seu Filium Dei naturam* humanam in personae* unitate assumere. atque naturas inter se ita uniri, et unam cum altera communionem habere, ut a Deitate, actionis passionisque ἀξίωσις, et meritum infinitum* esset, opus redemptionis omnino perfectum, applicatioque in electis efficax foret; adeoque homines a Deo per peccatum disjuncti, intermedio mediatore, ejusque justitia et sanctitate, Deo unirentur, filiationis jus acciperent, et haeredes vitae aeternae fierent, Joh. 6, 35. 51. et Act. 2, 28. Hebr. 9, 14. etc.

XLII *Finis** *remotus*,* est sapientiae, justitiae et misericordiae Dei ac φιλανθρωπίας, *amoris erga homines* ejus eximia demonstratio, ad ejus laudem et aeternam gloriam.

foremost be understood with respect to the hypostatic* union, "having emptied himself, and having been exalted, all power in heaven and on earth was given to Christ" (Matthew 28[:18]). That which the Son of God possesses from eternity was given to and accepted by the Son of Man in time.[34]

39 And so from these things, namely, the assumption of human nature* by the Son of God, the union and communion of the two natures, and finally, the corresponding phraseology, it is clear what distinguishes the man Christ from other men, even the most holy men. For in him "all the fullness of the Godhead dwells bodily" (Colossians 2[:9]). For the Son of Man is the Son of God, and whatever is the Son of Man's is of the Son of God.

40 And finally, the goal* of his incarnation is to accomplish the office that the Father had placed on him, and to obtain our salvation (Isaiah 9:6; Luke 2:7). He had to be a man, a true man in fact, so that true salvation for the man who had sinned might be obtained through a man. A complete and whole man, consisting of a soul and a body, and of their essential* properties, so that the entire man might be restored, in body and especially in soul. He was lowly, weak, and mortal, so that he could* suffer, pour out his blood, and die (for there is no redemption without death, and death is the price of redemption). "Man of man," or Son of Man, so that he should not make atonement by means of another nature.* He was made "from a virgin" in a supernatural* way by the power of the Holy Spirit, and having been sanctified by him, so that he as unique and set apart from sin, would be able* to take sin away and save us (Isaiah 53; Matthew 1:21, 23; Hebrews 2:9, 14, 16, and 7:26, etc.).

41 He had to be the "Son of God," or, the Son of God had to assume human nature* in the unity of person,* and to unite the two natures with each other, and to have one nature in communion with the other, so that from the Godhead the worthiness and merit of what he did and what he underwent would be eternal,* and the work of redemption would be entirely perfect, and the application of it in the elect would be effective. And to the end that men, who were separated from God through sin, by the intervention of the Mediator, and by his justice and holiness might be made one with God, might receive the right of sonship and obtain the inheritance of eternal life (John 6:35, 51; Acts 2:28; Hebrews 9:14, etc.).

42 The more removed,* or distant, goal* is the most excellent display of the wisdom, justice, and mercy of God, and his love for mankind (*philantrōpia*), to the praise of him and his eternal glory.

---

34 In these examples, the predicate (like "having descended from heaven") is not peculiar to one nature only, but to both the divine and the human nature in relation to one another.

ANTITHESES.

Ant. I Rejiciuntur primo *Judaei*, qui Messiae in carne adventum negant, et finem* adventus in beneficiis temporalibus collocant.

Ant. II Inde *Pseudochristiani*. Tum qui aeternam Filii Dei personam, veramque ejus Deitatem inficiantur; utpote,

1. *Arrius*, et qui nostro aevo Arrianismum renovavit *Ochinus*, qui λόγον ante secula factum, corpori conjunctum, et pro anima corpori infusum voluit.
2. *Samosatenus ac Photinus*, et qui nostra memoria, impietatem illius reposuerunt, *Servetus ac Socinus*, qui Christum ψιλόν hominem, sed θεοφόρον asserentes, hypostaticam* illam unionem negant.
3. *Sabellius et Praxeas*, et hodie *Libertini et Anabaptistae* quidam, qui Trinominem Deum statuentes,[a] et personarum* realem distinctionem tollentes, modumque* tantum patefactionis varium inducentes, Patrem incarnatum passumque revera, statuunt.

[a] Inducentes: 1625.

Antitheses

In the first place we reject the Jews who say that the Messiah has not come in the flesh, and who place the goal* of his coming in benefits that are temporal. Ant. 1

Thereafter we reject pseudo-Christians, of which there are several kinds. First are those who refuse to acknowledge the eternal Son of God and who deny his true deity. Such are: Ant. 2

i. Arius,[35] and Ochinus[36] (who has revived Arianism in our time), because he held the view that the *Logos* [Word] was made before all times, was joined to the body and poured into it instead of a soul.
ii. Paul of Samosata, and Photinus, along with Servetus and Socinus who in our time have put his ungodly belief forward again. They claim that Christ was god-bearer while being a mere man, and so deny the hypostatic* union.
iii. Sabellius and Praxeas,[37] the Libertines and some Anabaptists of our day, who construct God as having three distinct names,[38] erase the real distinction of the persons,* bring forward only a different way* in which God reveals himself, and think that it was actually the Father who became incarnate and suffered.

---

35 Arius (circa AD 280–336) was born in Libya and educated in the exegetical school of Antioch. He became a deacon and later presbyter in Alexandria. His teaching that the Son is not eternal and divine like the Father, but has been 'made,' spread rapidly and led emperor Constantine to convene the Council of Nicaea in 325, the first ecumenical council. Arianism is often considered to be the most important Christological heresy.

36 Bernardino Ochino (1487–1564), an Italian reformer, became a Franciscan friar around 1503 and earned a reputation as a preacher. In 1542 he fled with his friend Peter Martyr Vermigli to Switzerland and there joined the Reformation. He was compelled to move often and lived in Augsburg, Strasbourg, London, Zürich and Poland. Later he was accused of holding a number of unorthodox beliefs about marriage and the Trinity.

37 We know of Praxeas only through Tertullian's polemical work *Against Praxeas* (c. 213). He was born in Asia Minor and went to Rome around 190. He opposed Montanism, a movement to which Tertullian belonged and which was condemned as heretical. Tertullian fought Praxeas for his monarchianism, in particular his teaching that the Father had died on the cross. On Sabellius see *SPT* 8.21, note 22.

38 The Anabaptists, generally orthodox Trinitarians, were not trusted by the Reformed on this point as the extensive discussion of the doctrine at the Frankenthal Disputation (1571) shows. The Anabaptists had some difficulty with the Trinitarian term 'person' and were accused of claiming that "Father, Son, and Holy Spirit" were only three names. Gasper van der Heyden (ed.), *Protocol, dat is de gansche handelinge des gesprecks, te Franckenthal* ([Dordrecht]: [Jan Canin], 1571), 92.

4. Denique veteres *Tritheitae*, et qui eorum haeresin revocavit *Valentinus Gentilis*; qui essentiam* Dei distribuentes, ut personam, ita et essentiam simpliciter incarnatam volunt.

Ant. III Tum qui humanam in Christo naturam* evertunt. Utpote,

1. *Marcion* et similes, qui φάντασμα et speciem, hominem Christum docuerunt.
2. *Valentinus et Manes*, qui e coelo, seu coeleste, vel elementare corpus in Mariam illatum volunt; quorum errorem *Anabaptistae* quidam reduxerunt.

iv. Lastly, the Tritheists of former times,[39] and Valentinus Gentilis, who has brought back their heresy.[40] By splitting up the essence* of God, they hold the view that just as the person became incarnate, so too the essence in an absolute way.

The second kind [of pseudo-Christians] are those who erase Christ's human nature.* Such are: Ant. 3

i. Marcion and those like him,[41] who taught that the man Christ was only a phantom and an apparition.
ii. Valentinus[42] and Manes,[43] who hold the view that a body from heaven, a heavenly body, or a body of rudimentary elements was put into Mary. Their error has been brought back by some of the Anabaptists.[44]

---

39 John Philoponus (c. 490–c. 570), also known as John the Grammarian, was considered to be the main representative of tritheism in the early church. He was also a very important commentator of Aristotle. Other 'tritheists' were John's contemporaries bishop Conon of Tarsus and Athanasius, the grandson of empress Theodora. Cf. Aloys Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition* volume 2: From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590–604), part 4: The Church of Alexandria with Nubia and Ethiopia after 451. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 131–138.

40 For Giovanni Valentino Gentile or John Valentine Gentile (c. 1520–1566) see *SPT* 8.14, note 13.

41 Tertullian refutes Marcion's docetism and insists on the reality of Christ's body against the *phantasmata* of Marcion. See Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* 4.10, Ernest Evans (ed.), *Tertullian: Adversus Marcionem* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1972), 302–303. See also *SPT* 28.3. For Marcion and the Marcionites see *SPT* 8.4, note 5.

42 Valentinus (c. 100–c. 160) was a Christian gnostic. He was born in Egypt, educated in Alexandria and later moved to Rome. According to Tertullian, he almost became bishop of Rome and resented it deeply when another was chosen instead. Valentinus was considered by many to be the founder of the largest Christian gnostic movements. Thysius probably took his information about Valentinus's view on the incarnation from one of the classical heresiologies, like Irenaeus's *Against the Heresies* 1.7: "Christ passed through Mary just as water flows through a tube" (ANF 1:865). Another possible source is Tertullian's *Prescription Against Heretics* 4.27 (ANF 3:1147).

43 Mani (c. 216–274), in Latin Manes, was a Persian prophet and founder of Manicheism, which was widespread in antiquity. He believed himself to be the Paraclete, promised by Jesus. Augustine was at a time under the influence of Manicheism. Manicheism combines elements from different religions and is characterized by a strong dualism between light (good) and darkness (evil). Divine particles of light were thought to be imprisoned in evil bodies from which they have to escape. It is not clear what source Thysius used for attributing to Mani the view here mentioned. According to Augustine, Mani taught that Christ did not have a real body, but only a simulated one: Augustine, *De Haeresibus* 46, 15 (CSEL 46: 318).

44 Anabaptists, like Menno Simons and Dirk Philips, held a specific Christology, implying

3. *Apollinaris*, qui animam ejus rationalem negavit, et Filium Dei pro anima supposuit.

Ant. IV Tum, qui hypostaticam* ejus unionem impugnant. Ut,

1. *Nestorius*, qui, ut duae naturae* sunt in Christo, ita et duas personas* statuit, unitionemque factam non καθ᾽ ὑπόστασιν, *personam, sed κατὰ παράστασιν, assistentiam, ἐνοίκησιν, inhabitationem*, et σχέσιν, *habitudinem*.
2. *Eutyches*, qui contra, ut una est persona, ita naturas in Christo unam docuit, eas inter se confundens et commiscens, et tota illa Eutychetis propago, *Monophysitae, Monotheletae et Acephali*.
3. Denique, vicini his hodie *Anabaptistae, Mennonistae, Swencfeldiani et Ubiquitarii*, qui hypostaticam* unionem divinarum proprietatum, nempe Om-

---

that Jesus' flesh originated from heaven and not from Mary. This doctrine of the celestial or heavenly flesh stemmed from Melchior Hoffmann, who in turn was inspired by Schwenckfeld.

iii. Apollinaris,[45] who denied that Christ had a rational soul, and who substituted the soul with the Son of God.

And then there are those who attack his hypostatic* union. Such as: Ant. 4

i. Nestorius, who held that as in Christ there are two natures* there are also two persons,* and that the act of uniting happened not according to person but according presence, indwelling, and relation.

ii. Eutyches,[46] who taught the opposite: that just as there is one person so the natures are one in Christ, by confusing and intermingling the two natures. So too for that whole breed of Eutyches, the Monophysites, Monothelites, and Acephalites.[47]

iii. And next, those who today are allied with them, namely the Anabaptists, Mennonites, followers of Schwenckfeld,[48] and the Ubiquitarians,[49] who

45 Apollinaris was bishop of Laodicea in Syria (c. 310–c. 390). He defended the Christian faith against the Neoplatonic philosopher Porphyrius and opposed Arianism. Following the tripartite view of man as composed of body, soul, and spirit (cf. 1 Thessalonians. 5:23), Apollinaris taught that in the incarnation the eternal Logos assumed a human body and soul, but not the human spirit, which was replaced by the Logos. Athanasius and the Cappadocian fathers opposed his view and it was condemned by several local synods as of AD 362 and, finally, also by the First Council of Constantinople in 381. Due to this opposition, Apollinaris resigned as bishop in 375 and worked as a freelance teacher after that.

46 Eutyches (c. 378–c. 454) was head of a monastery near Constantinople. He vehemently opposed the view of Nestorius, the archbishop of Constantinople, who taught that in Christ there were two persons, one divine, the other human. Eutyches went to the other extreme and defended the position that in Christ there was only one nature (Monophysitism). In reaction to both, the Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon (451) declared that in Christ there is one person and two natures.

47 The *akephali* ('headless party') here refers to a monophysite sect that had no bishop as their head. They rejected the authority of Peter Mongus, the monophysite patriarch of Alexandria (477–490) in 482.

48 Kaspar Schwenckfeld von Ossig (1489–1561), a German reformer, was born in Silesia (now Poland). Inspired by Luther's texts, Schwenckfeld had a conversion experience in 1518, but later rejected Luther's view on the real presence of Christ. He defended a spiritualist, pacifist, non-dogmatic type of Christianity for which he and his followers were persecuted. Later in life he developed the doctrine of the 'divine' or 'celestial' body of Christ, according to which the human Christ was deified through passion, death, resurrection, and ascension.

49 At first, 'Ubiquitarians' referred to a specific party within Lutheranism, which maintained that Christ's human nature is now present everywhere and that its presence is not limited to only one place, namely heaven. An intra-Lutheran controversy over this issue arose in 1559, when Philip Melanchthon wrote that Christ's human body is located only in heaven. He was opposed by Johannes Brenz and Martin Chemnitz. The 'Ubiquitarian' view became

nipotentiae, Omniscientiae et Omnipraesentiae, reali in carnem effusione et communicatione, definiunt.

Ant. v Tum postremo, qui fines* incarnationis evertunt, ut infaustus ille *Faustus Socinus*, aliique qui meritum vitae et passionis Christi evacuant.

AMBROSIUS, lib. de Fide contra Arrianos, cap. 8.[a]

Exinanivit semetipsum, formam servi suscipiendo; non quod aliud quam quod erat, fieret, id est, non ut mutaretur ab eo quod erat, sed ut seposito interim majestatis suae honore, humanum corpus indueret, quo suscepto, salus gentium fieret. Ut enim sol cum nube tegitur, claritas ejus comprimitur, non secatur, et lumen illud, quod toto orbe dispersum, claro splendore cuncta perfundit, parvo obstaculo nubis includitur; sic homo ille, quem Deus induit, Deum in homine non intercepit, sed abscondit.

[a] Ambrose, *De fide orthodoxa contra Arianos* 6 (MPL 17:565). *On the Orthodox Faith Against the Arians* is no longer attributed to Ambrose. Gregory of Elvira is now thought to be the author and it is dated around 360; Cf. William A. Jurgens, *The Faith of the Early Fathers*, volume 1: A source-book of theological and historical passages from the Christian writings of the Pre-Nicene and Nicene eras (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1970), 392.

the majority position in Lutheran orthodoxy. Cf. McGinnis, *Son of God Beyond the Flesh*, 81–82. Therefore, 'Ubiquitarians' may here refer to Lutheranism in general.

define the hypostatic* union of the divine properties (omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence) as a real outpouring and sharing in the flesh.

And then finally, those who destroy the goals* of his incarnation, like that faulty Faustus Socinus, and others who have made void the merits of the life and suffering of Christ.[50] Ant. 5

Ambrose, *On the Orthodox Faith, Against the Arians*, chapter 8

He emptied himself by taking the form of a servant, not to become something other than what he was (that is, not to be changed from what he was), but so that by putting aside the honor of his majesty for a period of time, he might take for himself a human body, that by taking it up he might become salvation unto the gentiles. For it is like the sun when it is hidden by a cloud that conceals but does not cut off its brightness, and like the light, scattered all around the world and filling everything with its bright splendor, that is obstructed by the little hindrance of a cloud. In the same way that man, whom God took upon himself, did not in the man remove God, but merely hid him from view.

50 The Socinians denied the satisfaction through the death of Christ and the meritorious character of his obedience; see *RC*, 313–314. On the catechism see *SPT* 7.50, note 24 and 22.37, note 16. On Socinianism see *SPT* 2.28, note 31, 26.20–22, 31.10 and 29.

DISPUTATIO XXVI

De Officio Christi

Praeside D. JOHANNE POLYANDRO
Respondente NICOLAO REUSIO

THESIS I Omnis de Jesu Christo disputatio in duabus potissimum quaestionibus posita est, quarum prior est de Christi persona,* quae nuperrime fuit agitata; posterior de ipsius officio, quam nunc explicabimus.

II Officium Christi dupliciter considerari debet, aut generatim et universe, secundum rationem totius, aut sigillatim, secundum rationem cujusque partis. Si universe consideretur, est unicum, nempe mediatorium; si sigillatim et secundum partes, est triplex, Propheticum, Sacerdotale et Regium.

III Officium Christi mediatorium est, quo ex decreto sacrosanctae Trinitatis se Patri suo, nobis perduellionis reis offenso, sponsorem ac propitiatorem pro nostris peccatis ultro obtulit, ut eorum expiatione per obedientiam suam nostro loco in ara crucis peracta, nobis in ipsum credentibus, justitiam aeternam conferret, qua nos in gratiam* Patris sui, atque in haereditatem vitae sempiternae, ex qua per lapsum Adami excideramus, penitus restitueret, 1Joh. 2, 2. Col. 1, 20.

DISPUTATION 26

On the Office of Christ

President: Johannes Polyander
Respondent: Nicolaus Reusius[1]

The entire disputation about Jesus Christ is arranged into two main questions, 1
of which we very recently have treated the first, about the person* of Christ. Now we shall answer the second question, the one about his office.

We should consider Christ's office in two ways: either generally, universally, 2
according to the sense of it as a whole, or piece by piece, according to the arrangement of its parts. If it is considered universally, the office consists of one role, namely that of Mediator. If it is examined piecemeal and by its parts, the office is three-fold: prophetic, priestly, and kingly.

Christ's office as Mediator is the one whereby, following the decree of the 3
most holy Trinity, Christ freely offered himself to his Father—as it was He whom we had offended by our guilt of treason—as our sponsor and the propitiator for our sins, so that by expiating for them through his own obedience accomplished in our place on the altar of the cross he might bestow eternal righteousness on us who believe in him.[2] By this righteousness he would restore us completely into the grace* of his Father, and into the inheritance of life eternal, from which we had fallen through the fall of Adam (1John 2:2; Colossians 1:20).

---

1 Born c. 1598 in Alkmaar, Nicolaus Reusius matriculated on 1 May 1618 in philosophy. He defended this disputation in 1622. He was ordained in Oude Niedorp (province of Holland) in 1623 and Egmond 1628 and he died in 1675; see Du Rieu, *Album studiosorum*, 135 and Van Lieburg, *Repertorium*, 203.

2 This sentence contains some of the key terms of the Reformed doctrine of salvation. As a *sponsor*, Christ assumes our debt. The payment of the debt is described as *propitiatio* or *expiatio*; these terms evoke the context of sacrifices. By an expiatory sacrifice the guilt caused by an offense is purged and the debt is solved; see *DLGTT*, s.v. "expiatio" and "sponsio." In the decades following the publication of the *Synopsis*, these elements would receive further elaboration, especially in the school of Johannes Cocceius; see Willem J. van Asselt, *"Expromissio or Fideiussio?* A Seventeenth Century Theological Debate between Voetians and Cocceians about the Nature of Christ's Suretyship in Salvation History," *Mid-America Journal of Theology* 14 (2003): 37–57, esp. 40–46. The idea that Christ offered himself to his Father developed into the doctrine of the *pactum salutis* as an eternal covenant between the three persons of the Trinity.

IV Hoc officium nec Angelis, nec hominibus, sed soli Christo Immanueli imponere sacrosanctae Trinitati visum est. *Non Angelis*, quia potentia* sua finita, et a sola gratia Dei eam conservantis pendente, molem irae ipsius infinitae* sustinere, justitiaque sua ex se mutabili justitiam aeternam, in qua Deus prorsus acquiescat, peccatorum nomine ipsi offerre non poterant. *Non hominibus*, quoniam omnes sub peccati reatu conclusi, nullum insontem ex suo sanguine producere poterant, qui non sua potius, quam aliorum delicta lueret. *Soli Christo Immanueli*, quia secundum naturam* suam humanam poenas nobis debitas subire, secundum divinam, illas superare atque in salutem nostram convertere solus potuit.*

V Officium hoc sibi impositum Christus nostri misertus, suscepit, ut pace cum Patre suo per sanguinem crucis ejus facta, gratiaque adoptionis nostri impetrata, nos ex filiis Adami ac gehennae, filios ac haeredes Dei efficeret, Col. 1, 20. Joh. 1, 12. et 20, 17.

VI Mediationis ergo Jesu Christi causa* efficiens seu constituens est Dei decretum; προηγουμένη, seu Deum ad eam Christo demandandam in sese impellens, est ipsius erga nos εὐδοκία, seu propensa voluntas* et dilectio, Luc. 2, 14. Joh. 3, 16. 1Joh. 4, 9. 10.

VII Convenientissimum autem Deus summae suae dilectioni erga nos testandae existimavit, si Filio suo proprio atque unigenito non parceret, sed eum pro nobis omnibus ad supplicium traderet, ut propitiatio esset pro nostris peccatis, nosque per sanguinis ipsius ἱλαστήριον sibi reconciliatos filios adoptionis sanctificatos, in gloriam aeternam cum ipso adduceret, Joh. 3, 16. Rom. 8, 32. 1Joh. 4, 9. Rom. 3, 25. Hebr. 2, 10.

VIII Convenientissimum quoque sapientiae, veritati, justitiae, misericordiae ac potentiae* suae conjunctim nobis declarandae judicavit, si in Filio suo in forma, consimili carni peccato obnoxiae, ad nos misso, nostra peccata juxta legis suae comminationem exsecrabili morte digna, sic plecteret, ut ea simul ad nostri redemptionem jurisque sui impletionem in carne ipsius condemnaret, ac prorsus aboleret, Gen. 2, 17. Gal. 3, 10. Rom. 3, 25. et 8, 3. 4.

The most holy Trinity deemed it suitable to place this office not upon angels, 4
nor on men, but on Christ the Emmanuel alone. It was not placed upon angels, for, since their own power* is limited and dependent solely on God's grace to preserve it, they themselves were not able to bear the massive burden of his boundless* wrath, nor themselves able to produce from their own, changeable righteousness, that eternal righteousness which could appease God completely, in the name of sinners. He did not place it upon men, for since the guilt of sin has implicated them all, they could not have presented from their own blood anyone who was without guilt, as he could not pay the penalty for even his own sins, let alone those of others. It was placed only on Christ the Emmanuel, because by his own human nature* he alone was able to undergo the punishments we deserved; and by his divine nature he alone could* overcome them and turn them to our salvation.

Having pity on our condition, Christ accepted the office that was placed on 5
him, in order to make us from being sons of Adam and hell into sons and heirs of God, by making peace with the Father through the blood of the cross, and by obtaining the grace of adoption for us (Colossians 1:20; John 1:12 and 20:17).

And so it follows that the efficient or constitutive cause*[3] of the mediating 6
work of Christ is God's eternal decree. The impelling cause,* the one that drove God in himself to demand the mediating work of Christ, was his favorable will* and good pleasure toward us, his love (Luke 2:14; John 3:16; 1 John 4:9,10).

Moreover, God deemed that the most fitting display of his own great love 7
towards us would be to not spare his own and only-begotten Son, but to hand him over to punishment for the sake of us all. Thus he would be the propitiation for our sins, and, having reconciled us unto him through atonement[4] in his blood, to sanctify us and take us as adopted children into eternal glory with him (John 3:16; Romans 8:32; 1 John 4:9; Romans 3:25; Hebrews 2:10).

He also deemed that it would be a very fitting declaration to us of his wisdom, 8
truth, righteousness, mercy, and power* jointly together if in his own Son, sent to us in the likeness of the flesh that is under the rule of sin, he should smite our sins that by the Law's warnings deserved horrible death. In this way he would condemn and even abolish the sins in his flesh, while delivering us and also accomplishing his justice (Genesis 2:17; Galatians 3:10; Romans 3:25 and 8:3,4).

---

3 Here *causa constituens* is a synonym of *causa efficiens*. On 'efficient cause,' and the Aristotelian scheme of causes generally, see *SPT* 1.13, note 13 and the explanation given in the Glossary s.v. "causa."

4 The term *hilastērion* is taken from Romans 3:25. In the objective sense, it refers to that which makes expiation. Cf. *DLGTT*, s.v. "hilastērion," and *SPT* 29.24, 30.

IX Ad quaestionem, *An Deo alius modus** *defuerit, quo nos a miseria mortalitatis hujus liberaret?* sic respondendum putat *Augustinus*, Sanandae nostrae miseriae modum divinae dignitati convenientiorem alium, quam per mediatorem Dei et hominum Jesum Christum, non fuisse, nec esse oportuisse; tametsi Deo, si ipsius infinitam,* nobisque inexplicabilem sapientiam atque absolutam* potentiam* spectemus, cui cuncta aequaliter subjacent, alius modus possibilis non defuerit, *Lib. de Trinitate* 13. cap. 10.[a]

X Etsi haec pia et prudens sit Augustini responsio, ideoque a nonnullis Theologis orthodoxis approbetur, nullam tamen causam video, cur nos in quaestione illa enodanda anxie fatigemus, cum unicum illum nos per Christum redimendi modum, aeterno atque immoto Dei decreto tantummodo determinatum* esse, sacrae literae passim attestentur.

XI Ut ergo quaestionem illam breviter perstringamus, alium praeter eum quem ex Verbo Dei supra demonstravimus,* salutis nostrae procurandae modum,* nec sine temeritate indagari, nec sine impietate excogitari posse respondemus. Quam vero periculosa sit quaestionis illius olim *Augustino* propositae, ac nunc silentio potius praetermittendae, quam intempestive revocandae, in utramque partem velitatio, vel ex novissimo *Scholasticorum** exemplo aestimari potest, qui de ea Peripateticorum more inter se dissertantes, aliis mediationis Christo assignatae veritatem ac necessitatem* in dubium vocandi, aliis negandi causam praebuerunt.

XII Horum Coryphaeus est impius ille et infaustus *Socinus*, qui Deum absque tali satisfactionis modo,* qualem Sacra Scriptura mediatori nostro Jesu Christo ascribit, non tantum posse* peccata nobis remittere, sed etiam debere, hoc nostro seculo sustinere non dubitavit. Duplicem enim necessitatem* hypotheticam genus* humanum ea, quam Thesi 3. ex Sacra Scriptura definivimus, via ac

[a] Augustine, *De trinitate* 13.10,13 (CCSL 50A:399–400).

9 Augustine thinks that we should give the following answer to the question whether God lacked another means* of delivering us from the misery of this death. No other means more befitting God's worthiness existed or should have existed, for curing us of our misery than through Jesus Christ as the Mediator between God and men. Nevertheless [says Augustine], if we consider his infinite* and for us inexplicable wisdom, and his absolute* power*[5] (to which everything is equally subject), another possible means was available to him (*On the Trinity*, book 13, chapter 10).

10 Even though Augustine's answer is an upright and prudent one (and consequently is approved by some orthodox theologians),[6] nevertheless I see no reason why we should worry and weary ourselves with untangling that question, since the sacred writings everywhere testify that God's eternal and fixed decree had determined* only that special way to redeem us through Christ.

11 Even so, to touch on that question briefly, our answer is that one would be foolhardy to investigate (let alone contrive) any method* of obtaining salvation for us other than the one we pointed out* above from the Word of God. It is a question we would do better to pass over in silence than to broach so inopportunely. One can judge for oneself how risky it is to wrangle in either direction over the question that Augustine had put forward so long ago. One can judge this also from the latest example of the Schoolmen,* who debated the question amongst themselves like Peripatetics,[7] and gave to some people a reason to call into question the truth and need* of assigning the work of mediation to Christ, and to others a reason to deny it altogether.

12 The leading member of this group is that godless miscreant, Socinus,[8] who in our current age did not hesitate to maintain that God not only is able* but even ought to grant us remission of sins without such manner* of satisfaction that sacred Scripture ascribes to our Mediator, Jesus Christ. For he denies that [God] placed on Christ the two-fold hypothetical necessity* of reconciling the human race* in that way and manner defined from sacred Scripture in thesis three

5 On God's 'absolute power,' see *SPT* 6.36 and the Glossary s.v. "potentia absoluta." The exact term 'absolute power' does not occur in Augustine. For the criticism expressed in the next thesis see also *SPT* 24.60.

6 Some Reformed orthodox theologians defended the Scotian view that God could have redeemed us by different means than he actually does. Later this view gained some prominence through the works of William Twisse, *Vindiciae gratiae, potestatis, ac providentiae Dei* (Amsterdam: Willem Blaeu, 1632) and Samuel Rutherford, *Disputatio scholastica de divina providentia* (Edinburgh: George Anderson, 1649).

7 'Peripatetics' refers to Aristotelian philosophers; the term is used in a pejorative and unspecific way here.

8 Polyander makes a pun upon the Latin *infaustus* (miscreant) to refer to Faustus Socinus.

ratione cum Deo reconciliandi negat Christo esse impositam, quarum prima ab immutabili* pendet Dei decreto, altera ab infallibili divinarum praedictionum veritate. Unde illam immutabilitatis, hanc infallibilitatis necessitatem nuncupamus.

XIII De posteriore necessitate* sic loquitur Christus Luc. 24, 25. ut ad priorem quoque respiciat, cum suos discipulos his verbis affatur: *O amentes et tardi corde ad credendum omnibus quae locuti sunt Prophetae! Nonne haec oportuit pati Christum et introire in gloriam suam?*

XIV Nulla tamen coactus necessitate,* sed libera sua ac propensa ad nostram salutem motus voluntate* arduum illud opus amplexus est, promptaque erga Deum obedientia in carne sua peregit; sicuti de ipso testatur Esaias, cap. 53. vers. 10. *Jehova* (inquit) *ipsum conterere delectatus est, quoniam sacrificium pro reatu semetipsum exposuit*. Et Apostolus Phil. 2, 6. *Cum esset in forma Dei, non duxit rapinam parem esse cum Deo sed ipse se exinanivit, forma servi accepta, factus Deo obediens usque ad mortem crucis*.

XV Cum itaque Christus mortem illam crucis ad quam fuerat praeordinatus, et necessario, et sua sponte subierit, falsa est haec nonnullorum opinio, quod praeordinata necessitas* et voluntatis* libertas in eodem subjecto* ad idem opus producendum concurrere nequeant, sed una earum introducta, altera prorsus expellatur.

XVI Quamvis hic Jesus Christus communi* totius Trinitatis decreto, noster Mediator sit constitutus, ipsius tamen ad munus suum exsequendum nobis dati ac missi consecratio, Deo Patri, ordinis respectu, ab ipso κατ᾽ ἐξοχήν, ac peculiariter attribuitur, Luc. 2, 49. Joh. 5, 36. et 6, 27. et 8, 42. et 10, 25. Quam consecrationem Deus, tum suo, tum legatorum suorum testimonio,* sub utroque foedere sancire voluit: Suo, Ps. 110, 4. Legatorum suorum, nempe, Prophetarum,

(above), of which the first necessity* depends on God's immutable* decree and the second on the infallible truth of God's predictions. For this reason we call the first necessity that of immutability, and the second one the necessity of infallibility.[9]

In Luke 24:25 Christ speaks in this way about the second necessity,* while he has also the first necessity in view, when he addresses his disciples with these words: "O [are] you foolish and slow of heart to believe everything which the prophets have spoken? Was it not necessary for Christ to suffer these things and [then] to enter into his own glory?" 13

However, it was not any necessity* that forced him, but moved by his own free and favorable goodwill* for our salvation he embraced that difficult task, and he performed it in his flesh with prompt obedience towards God. Thus Isaiah testifies about him in chapter 53:10: "The Lord," he says, "was pleased to bruise him, since he has made himself to be the offering for sin." And the apostle says in Philippians 2:6[–8]: "Though he was in the form of God he did not consider being equal to God something to be grasped but he emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, and he became obedient unto God even to the death of the cross." 14

Therefore since it was both out of necessity and of his own accord that Christ underwent the death on the cross for which he had been pre-ordained, the opinion that some people hold is wrong, namely that pre-ordained necessity* and freedom of will* cannot come together in the same subject* for one single task, but that when one of them has been introduced, the other is entirely driven out. 15

Whereas it was by the decree common* to the entire Trinity that Jesus Christ was established as our Mediator, nevertheless the consecration of him being given and sent to us to carry out his task is attributed particularly and especially to God the Father in light of the rank that belongs to him (Luke 2:49; John 5:36; 6:27; 8:42, and 10:25). It was God's will to sanction this consecration by means of his own testimony* as well as that of those He sent, in both testaments. For his own testimony see Psalm 110:4; for the testimony* of those He sent, namely 16

9 In thesis 9, it was made clear that the salvation by means of Christ the Mediator is not necessary for God in an *absolute* sense. In addition, two forms of *hypothetical* necessity are indicated. The first rests on the divine decree: given the fact that God decides for this way of salvation, and granted that God does not change his decree, the manner of salvation itself is necessary in the sense of being unchangeable. The second necessity derives from the predictions given in Scripture: since God does not fail to fulfill his own promises, the way of salvation will infallibly turn out as it was predicted.

Es. 53. et Zach. 12. Angelorum, Luc. 1, 31. 32. et 2, 10. 11. Johannis Baptistae et Apostolorum, Act. 10, 38. 39.

XVII Haec Jesu Christi consecratio, vel secundum naturam* ipsius divinam, vel secundum humanam expendenda est. Illius respectu, quatenus est sermo* Patri suo coaeternus, ad munus mediatorium destinatus. Hujus respectu, quatenus est homo nobis consimilis factus, ad idem munus in plenitudine temporis a Deo praestituti sanctificatus unctione Spiritus Sancti.

XVIII In opere, quod ex muneris illius functione exsistit, utraque Christi natura* partes suas agit, non separatim, sed conjunctim, nec confuse, sed distincte. Ad commune* etenim ἀποτέλεσμα θεανδρικὸν producendum, talem divina natura societatem init cum humana, ut quemadmodum anima in nudo homine agit principaliter, corpus instrumentaliter, sic in actione Christi Θεανθρώπου divina natura causae* principalis, humana autem minus principalis ac ministrae rationem habeat.

XIX Inde est, quod idem opus, ad quod duae in Christo naturae* concurrunt, toti Christo Sacra Scriptura ita attribuat, ut infinitam* officii mediatorii dignitatem et efficaciam virtuti Deitatis in ipso corporaliter habitantis, quam nomine* Spiritus denotat, penitus attribuat, ut cum Rom. 1, 3. 4. dicitur, *Christum secundum Spiritum sanctificationis declaratum fuisse potenter Filium Dei per resurrectionem ex mortuis*. Et 1 Pet. 3, 18. *Eum Spiritu vivificatum, per Spiritum olim profectum spiritibus immorigeris praedicasse*. Item Marc. 2, 8. *Eum Spiritu suo cognovisse quid Scribae apud se in cordibus suis ratiocinarentur*. Et Heb. 9, 14.

the Prophets, see Isaiah 53 and Zechariah 12, the angels, see Luke 1:31–32 and 2:10–11, John the Baptist and the apostles, see Acts 10:38–39.

We may ponder this consecration of Christ with a view to his divine and his human nature.* Regarding the former, inasmuch as he is the Word* that is co-eternal with the Father from before all ages, he was appointed to the task of Mediator. Regarding the latter, inasmuch as he was made man (like us in every respect), he was sanctified for that very task by the anointing of the Holy Spirit in the fullness of time as determined beforehand by God. 17

Each nature* of Christ performs its own role in the work required to fulfill that task, and it does so jointly, not separately, and yet not jumbled together but distinctly. For in order to perform the work common* to the divine and human natures,*[10] the divine nature* enters upon a partnership with the human nature in a way like the soul of a mere human being behaves as the principle while the body acts as its instrument.[11] So too in the action of Christ the God-and-man the divine nature performs the role of the principal cause* while the human nature performs the role of helper, and less that of principle. 18

And so it is that sacred Scripture assigns to the whole Christ[12] the same work for which the two natures* of Christ come together, in such a way that it attributes the infinite* worthiness and efficacy of the mediatorial office entirely to the power of the Godhead that is dwelling bodily in him[13] (which it calls* the Spirit), as when it says in Romans 1:3 and 4 that Christ, "according to the Spirit of sanctification was declared with power to be the Son of God through the resurrection from the dead." And 1 Peter 3:18: "He was made alive by the Spirit, and through the Spirit he once went to preach to the disobedient spirits." Similarly, in Mark 2:8 it says that "he knew in his Spirit what the scribes were thinking in their hearts." And Hebrews 9:14: "Through the eternal Spirit he 19

10 *Apotelesma theandrikon*: the 'theandric operation' refers to the co-operation of the two natures of Christ, through the gift of divine grace, for the purpose of completing the work of the Mediator. See *DLGTT*, s.v. "communicatio idiomatum / communicatio proprietatum" and "communicatio operationum," and cf. Heinrich Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics: Set Out and Illustrated from the Sources*, trans. G.T. Thomson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 433. In *SPT* 25.31, it is explained that while the two natures of Christ have their distinct operations (*energeiai*), the resulting completed work (*apotelesma*) should be attributed to the one person of the God-and-man.

11 This comparison differs from Apollinaris's view that the Logos assumed a human body and soul, but not the human spirit, which was replaced by the Logos; see *SPT* 25 antithesis 3.iii, note 43.

12 See *SPT* 25.34 for the distinction between "the whole Christ" (*totus Christus*) and "the whole of Christ" (*totum Christi*).

13 Colossians 2:9.

Eum per Spiritum aeternum semetipsum Deo inculpatum obtulisse, ut nostram conscientiam emundaret ad serviendum Deo vivo.

XX Errant ergo Judaei et Sociniani qui in Christo Mediatore divinam naturam* non agnoscunt, quorum errorem alibi refutavimus, in Disputatione de Trinitate et Filio Dei.

XXI Atque haec causa* est, cur Judaei et Sociniani, non minus doctrinam nostram de Christi mediatione, quam de ipsius Deitate oppugnent. Judaei enim Christum esse Messiam olim Patribus suis sub Veteri Testamento promissum inficias eunt. Sociniani non quidem tam aperte, ac Judaei, sententiae orthodoxae de officio Christi mediatorio contradicunt, sed eam oblique et per cuniculos evertere conantur, cum Christum non proprie,* sed metaphorice se ipsum Deo obtulisse asserunt.

XXII Si vera est haec Socinianorum assertio, ergo et typicae oblationes sub Veteri Testamento, non proprie* oblationes vocatae fuerunt, sed metaphorice, et nostrae oblationes spirituales quae nobis in Novo Testamento praescribuntur, metaphorice sic dictae, Christi oblationi sunt hac in parte coaequales. Quarum utraque conclusio ex illa Socinianorum assertione recte deducta, manifestissimis Sacrae Scripturae testimoniis* repugnat.

XXIII Errant quoque *Andraeae Osiandri* discipuli, qui officium mediatorium soli naturae* divinae Jesu Christi attribuunt. Nam secundum Dei praescriptum nobis verbo ipsius declaratum, Christus non tantum Ecclesiam suam intus Spiritu suo regere atque adversus omnes hostes potenter conservare, sed externa

offered himself unblemished to God, that he might cleanse our conscience to serve the living God."

Therefore the Jews and the Socinians err when they do not acknowledge the 20
divine nature* in Christ the Mediator. We have refuted their error elsewhere, in the disputation on the Trinity and the Son of God.[14]

And this is also the reason* why the Jews and Socinians attack our doctrine 21
about Christ's mediation no less than the one about his divinity. For the Jews deny that Christ is the Messiah who was once promised to the fathers under the Old Testament. The Socinians certainly speak less openly than the Jews against the orthodox understanding of Christ's mediatorial office, but they do try to undermine it indirectly by creating pitfalls, when they claim that Christ had offered himself to God not in the literal sense* but metaphorically.[15]

If this claim of the Socinians is true, then also the prefigurative sacrifices 22
under the Old Testament were called sacrifices not in the strict sense* but metaphorically; and the spiritual sacrifices that we are prescribed in the New Testament, said thus to be metaphorical, are in this aspect on a par with the sacrifice made by Christ. As both of these conclusions are drawn correctly from the claim of the Socinians, they conflict with the very clear testimonies* of sacred Scripture.

Also the followers of Andreas Osiander err, when they ascribe the media- 23
torial office only to Christ's divine nature.*[16] For according to the command of God revealed to us in his Word, Christ should not only rule his Church inwardly by his Spirit, and powerfully defend it against all enemies, but also instruct and

---

14 See *SPT* 8.22–30.

15 According to thesis 3 above the 'offering' of Christ is the central act of Christ's office as the Mediator. As the *Racovian Catechism* makes clear, the Socinians claimed that the word 'redemption' was metaphorical and not literal; see *RC*, 315–316.

16 Andreas Osiander (1498–1552) was ordained priest in 1520 at Nuremberg. In 1522, he adopted the views of Martin Luther and took a prominent part in the reformation of Nuremberg. Osiander participated in various theological debates, and published a *Harmony of the Gospels* in 1537. In 1550, two disputations on Law and Gospel and on justification were published in which Osiander defended the view that believers are made righteous by the indwelling of Christ's divine nature, not by the imputation of the satisfaction through Christ's sacrifice on the Cross. John Calvin gave an extensive refutation of the views of Osiander in his *Institutes*, 1.15.3 and 3.11.5–12. For a critical review of the debates between Osiander and other reformers see Stephen Strehle, *The Catholic Roots of the Protestant Gospel: Encounters between the Middle Ages and the Reformation*, Studies in the History of Christian Thought 60 (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 73–85. It is not likely that Polyander has contemporary followers of Osiander in mind, because his views were refuted in the *Formula of Concord* (1577).

quoque Evangelii sui praedicatione docere ac consolari, nec tantum per Spiritum suum aeternum Dei iram aeternam sistere, sed etiam sanguinis sui effusione nobis placare debuit.

XXIV Errant etiam *Doctores Pontificii* qui docent, ut liquet ex scriptis Bellarm. si sermo sit non de ipso supposito* Jesu Christo, sed de formali actionum ipsius principio,* hoc principium esse humanam Christi naturam,* non divinam, Bellarm. lib. 5. *De Christo Mediat.* cap. 1. et 3.[a] Ad quorum refutationem praecipua ac firmissima argumenta ex thesi superiori 19. deduci possunt.

XXV His enim positis ac concessis axiomatibus:

1. Christum esse operis mediatorii suppositum* ac principium* commune,* non qua Deus est, nec qua homo tantum, sed qua simul Deus et homo est.
2. Humanam Christi naturam* ad illud opus cum divina concurrentem, divinae tamquam causae* superiori ac principaliter agenti inservire.
3. Infinitam* mediationis Christi dignitatem atque efficaciam Deitati ipsius in sacris Bibliis ascribi; Ex iis haec necessario sequuntur:

1. Opus Christi mediatorium, non ex virtute unius tantum naturae, sed ex vi utriusque secundum suam proprietatem agentis proficisci.
2. Humanam naturam in opere Θεανδρικῷ divinae administram, nec tantummodo vocari posse principium* actionis mediatoriae, nec proprie* formale, sed materiale potius, vel instrumentale.
3. Christum hominem absque Deitatis suae praesidio atque auxilio, nec sapientiae divinae mysteria ex Patris sui sinu proferre, nec ipsi λύτρον sufficiens pro nostris peccatis offerre, portasque inferorum sua morte confringere olim in hisce terris potuisse,* nec etiamnum in coelis posse* electorum suorum ubivis terrarum degentium preces exaudire simul et Patri suo commendare, eosque voti compotes ab omni malo tueri.

XXVI Etsi Christum secundum naturam* divinam nostrum esse Mediatorem affirmemus, non inde tamen adversus nos recte concluditur, quod totam quoque Trinitatem mediatoris officium suscepisse a nobis concedi oporteat. Natura

[a] Bellarmine, *De Christo* 2.5.1–2 (“De Mediatore, et eius merito”; *Opera* 1:435–438a).

comfort it by the outward preaching of his Gospel; and he not only should have put a stop to God's eternal wrath through his eternal Spirit, but also have atoned for us by the shedding of his blood.

Also the papal theologians go wrong, as is evidenced in the writings of 24
Bellarmine, when the discussion is not about the actual subject,* Jesus Christ, but about the formal principle* of his deeds: that this principle is Christ's human nature* and not his divine one (Bellarmine, *On Christ as Mediator*, book 5, chapter 1 and 3). To refute them, one can take the chief, most cogent arguments from thesis nineteen above.

For we offer to posit the following axiomatic statements:[17] 1. that Christ is 25
the subject* and common* principle* of the mediatorial work, not in that he is God nor in that he is man only, but in that he is simultaneously God and man. 2. That Christ's human nature* is coming together with the divine nature for that work, as serving the divine, which is the higher cause* that acts as the principal one. 3. That the sacred books of the Bible ascribe the infinite* worthiness and efficacy of Christ's mediation to his divinity, and from them necessarily come the following points: 1) Christ's mediatorial work proceeds not by the strength of one nature only but by the power of both as each acts following its own property. 2) Christ's human nature serves the divine nature in the work of the God-and-man, and one cannot simply call it the starting-point* for the mediatorial action, nor just the strictly* formal starting-point,* but rather the material or instrumental one.[18] 3) Without the protection and support of his divinity, the man Christ was not able* to extend the mysteries of divine wisdom from the bosom of his Father, nor to pay him a ransom sufficient for our sins, nor in time past to rend asunder the gates of hell by his death on this earth. And even now he would not be able* to hear in heaven the prayers of his chosen ones dwelling over all the earth and likewise to commend them to his Father, or grant them their request to shield them from all evil.

While we do maintain that Christ is our Mediator according to his divine 26
nature,* yet it is not right for that reason to conclude against us that we must moreover admit that the entire Trinity undertook the mediatorial office. For

17 See *SPT* 25.26–28 on the unity of the divine and human nature in one person, and *SPT* 25.29–31 on the ascription of the common works of both natures.

18 This sentence expresses the primacy of Christ's divine nature over his human nature in the work of mediation. Whereas the divine nature is the proper 'principle of action,' the human nature can only be called the 'material' or 'instrumental' principle. It is an instrument taken into the service of the divine nature to perform its task. It is also the matter (the word 'matter' includes the physical, bodily aspect of Christ's humanity) on which the work of salvation is performed. God acts in the human existence of Christ. Cf. the Glossary s.v. "causa."

enim ipsius divina humanae opposita, non in genere accipienda est pro essentia* tribus personis* communi,* sed singulariter, pro secunda Trinitatis persona quae carnem nostram assumpsit.

XXVII Hoc igitur loco per Christi naturam* divinam non indeterminate naturam Deitatis, sed determinate personam* Deitatis proprio subsistendi modo* ab aliis distinctam, Dei Patris scilicet Filium intelligimus, sicuti e contrario carnis appellatione, non hominis personam,* sed naturam* humanam cum Dei Filio unitate personae* indissolubiliter conjunctam designamus.

XXVIII Nec quia mediatio ad opera Dei ad extra* refertur, quae sunt indivisa, ideo ea tribus personis* absolute* communis* est, cum partim sit essentialis,* quatenus a totius essentiae* principio* promanat, partim personalis,* quatenus in persona ordine secunda, tamquam in termino* essentiae* divinae, οἰκονομία* seu dispensatio* spectatur. Eodem enim respectu hic Filio Dei potius quam Patri aut Spiritui Sancto, mediatio tribuitur, quo incarnatio ac generis humani redemptio ipsi sigillatim assignatur.

XXIX Tametsi ob istam mediationem Filius Dei minor sit Patre, non propterea ipso minor est quoad Deitatem. Mediationem enim suam a Patre accepit per communem et voluntariam totius Trinitatis, atque adeo sui ipsius, dispensationem.* Deitas vero ipsa a solo Patre per genituram naturalem* communicata

putting his divine nature over against his human one should not be taken generally for the essence* that is common* to the three persons,* but separately, only for the second person of the Trinity who assumed our flesh.[19]

Therefore on this point we mean by the divine nature* of Christ not the 27
nature of the Godhead in an indefinite sense, but in the definite sense of one person* of the Godhead as distinguished from the others by his own mode* of subsistence, namely, the Son of God the Father. Similarly, with the opposite name 'flesh' we designate not the person* of a man but the human nature* that is joined indissolubly to the Son of God in the unity of person.*

And while the mediation is related to the works of God that are directed 28
outwardly* (and these cannot be divided), it is not for that reason entirely* common* to the three persons,* since it is partly essential* (insofar as the starting-point* from which it flows is the entire essence*) and partly personal (insofar as the dispensation* or arrangement* concerns the person who is second in order—as in the end-term* of the divine essence*).[20] For the mediation is here attributed to the Son of God rather than to the Father or the Holy Spirit with respect to the same thing whereby the incarnation and the redemption of the human race is attributed separately to him.

Although the Son of God is less than the Father because of that mediation, he 29
is not therefore less than him in his deity. For he accepted his mediatorial task from the Father by a dispensation* that was shared* and willed by the Trinity as a whole—and that included himself. But the divinity itself was communicated to him by the Father alone through natural* generation.[21] In the age that is to

19 See the Glossary s.v. "essentialis" and "personalis," and cf. *SPT* 6.12, 7.26, 8.2.

20 In Christ's assumption of human nature, medieval Scholastics like Thomas Aquinas distinguished between the 'principle' of the act of assuming and its 'term.' The first belongs to the divine nature, but the second only to the Son. Thus it is possible to maintain both Augustine's rule that the works directed outwardly (*ad extra*) are common to all three persons and the statement that only the Son becomes human. See Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 3.3.2.4. Wollebius states that the incarnation in its inception (*inchoative*) is the work of the whole Trinity, but in its end-term (*terminative*) is the work of the Son alone. See Johannes Wollebius, *Christianae theologiae compendium* (Basel: Johann Jacob Genath, 1626), 61; cf. Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 413. For the use of this distinction by later theologians such as Franciscus Turretin and Johann Gerhard see Seng-Kong Tan, "Trinitarian Action in the Incarnation," in *Jonathan Edwards as Contemporary: Essays in Honor of Sang Hyun Lee*, ed. Don Schweitzer (New York [etc.]: Peter Lang, 2010), 127–150, 133 (in particular note 73). A slightly different terminology is used in *SPT* 25.6; the Father is the source (*fons*) of the incarnation, the Son is the means (*medium*), the Spirit is the end-term (*terminus*).

21 See *SPT* 8.7.

est. Illam in altero seculo deponet, cum sceptrum suum Patri tradet; hanc cum Patre in aeternum immutabilem* retinebit, 1 Cor. 15, 27. 28.

xxx Eadem gratiae* dispensatione* qua Dei Filius mediationem sibimet ipsi una cum Patre et Spiritu Sancto ab aeterno destinavit, eadem in sua carne tempore praestituto eam apud semetipsum quoque obire voluit, nimirum analogice,* et ad se reductive, id est, Deitatem sibi cum Patre et Spiritu Sancto communem* etiam ad se referendo ex jure communitatis.

xxxi Quemadmodum igitur Christus secundum naturam* Deitatis tribus personis* communem,* secundum quam Patri et Spiritui Sancto est ὁμοούσιος, sui ipsius etiam est mediator, sic secundum singularem ac sibi propriam personalitatem, et secundum gratiae* dispensationem* qua factus est Θεάνθρωπος, apud Patrem et Spiritum Sanctum Mediatoris munere fungitur, etiamsi in sacris literis ratione ordinis oeconomici* functio ipsius ad Patrem tantummodo verbis expressis referatur; in qua non tantum legati et internuncii, sed etiam obsidis nostri culpam morte sua expiantis officium sic praestitit, ut in ipsa cruce de morte aliisque hostibus suis prostratis palam triumphaverit, Col. 2, 15.

xxxii Aliorum internunciorum atque obsidum exempla quae ad hujus exempli illustrationem ex variis historiis proferuntur, plus quam toto genere ab eo differunt, cum aut insontes mortis poenam pro aliis sontibus non subierint, aut eam pro aliorum crimine subeuntes, ex ejus discrimine victores non evaserint.

xxxiii De mediationis subjecto* Jesu Christo, ejusque causa* efficiente ac movente, satis egimus; objectum ejus est Deus offensus, et homo offensae reus. Quod Apostolus clarissime testatur, cum ait, *Unus est Mediator Dei et hominum, homo Christus Jesus*, 1 Tim. 2, 5.

xxxiv Exsistit hoc loco quaestio de bonis Angelis, utrum Christus ipsorum quoque Mediator sit appellandus. Nos iis astipulamur, qui Christum quidem

come he will lay aside his office of Mediator when he will hand over his scepter to the Father; yet he will hold on to his divinity with the Father unchanged* for ever and ever (1 Corinthians 15:27, 28).[22]

By the same dispensation* of grace* whereby the Son of God, together 30
with the Father and the Holy Spirit, determined from eternity to accept the mediation for himself, he willed also to discharge it with himself in his flesh at the appointed time. He did so in an analogical* and self-reductive sense; that is to say, [he did so] by referring also to himself the divinity he shares* with the Father and the Holy Spirit, by the right of the fellowship he has with them.[23]

Just as Christ is, therefore, also Mediator for himself by the nature* shared* 31
by the three persons* of the Godhead (whereby he is of one essence with the Father and the Holy Spirit), so by the unique personality proper to himself and the dispensation* of grace* whereby he was made God-and-man he also performs the office of Mediator before the Father and the Holy Spirit. Nevertheless, in the sacred writings his office is expressly related only to the Father because of the order in the dispensation.* In being not only ambassador and go-between but also the surety that atones for our guilt by his death, he executed his office in such a way that on the very cross he clearly triumphed over death and his other defeated enemies (Colossians 2:15).

The examples of other go-betweens and sureties that people adduce from 32
various historical accounts to illustrate this one instance are more than entirely different from it, since either the innocent did not undergo the penalty of death for the sake of the others who were guilty, or if they did undergo it for the wicked deeds of others, they did not come away victorious from that test.

We have sufficiently treated the subject* of the mediation, Jesus Christ, 33
and its efficient or moving cause.* The objects of the mediation are God, the offended party, and mankind, the party guilty of the offense.[24] The apostle testifies to this very clearly when he says: "There is one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus" (1 Timothy 2:5).

At this point a question arises about the good angels: whether Christ should 34
be called also their Mediator. We are in agreement with those who state that

22 See also theses 53–54 below.

23 The terms 'analogical' and 'self-reductive' are somewhat enigmatic. The statement of thesis 30 seems to extend the distinction between the Trinity as the common 'principle' of mediation and the second person as its 'end-term' (thesis 28). In the general and original sense, the Triune God relates his divine nature to the human nature in the person of Christ. In a more specific and analogical way, the Son of God as the second person relates his own 'share' of divinity to his own assumed human nature.

24 'Subject': he who mediates; 'objects': those who are mediated.

conservationis bonorum Angelorum causam* mediam vel mediantem esse affirmant, sed Christum propterea eorundem Mediatorem vocandum esse pernegant.

xxxv Nunquam enim Christus respectu conservationis, sed semper respectu reconciliationis cum Deo offenso, electorum suorum Mediator in S. Scriptura nuncupatur. Nulla autem fuit, nec erit inter Deum et bonos Angelos discordia. Ideo Christus ipsos non assumpsit, sed semen Abrahae, ut inter Deum Patrem suum, secundum divinam naturam,* et inter nos fratres suos secundum carnem ex semine Abrahae assumptam, tamquam propitiator inter duas partes dissidentes interveniens, nos in gratiam Patris sui in se ipso reconciliaret, Heb. 2, 16.

xxxvi Cum ergo beati Angeli, nunc filii, nunc electi Dei in sacris literis nominantur, ita accipiendum est, quod ipsi in Christo capite ac principe suo electi manu ipsius potentissima, secundum perpetuam electionis divinae gratiam,* in sua quam per ipsum acceperunt, origine ac veritate conserventur, ut in ea immutabiliter permanentes, beata atque immediata Dei visione in sempiternum perfruantur, Job. 1, 6. et 2, 1. 1 Tim. 5, 21. Col. 2, 10. Heb. 12, 22. Joh. 8, 44. Jud. 6.

xxxvii Forma officii mediatorii in tribus illius partibus ac functionibus, quas ex se solus exsequitur, liquido apparet, nimirum, in Prophetica, Sacerdotali ac Regia.

xxxviii Ratione triplicis illius functionis in ipso solo conjunctim animadvertendae, dicitur nobis a Deo factus sapientia, justitia, sanctificatio, redemptio, 1 Cor. 1, 30. *Sapienta* nobis factus est, ut nos corde amentes, institutione sua prophetica sapientes reddat ad salutem. *Justitia et sanctificatio*, ut secundum duplicem muneris sui sacerdotalis conditionem, primum laesae Majestati divinae suo pro nostris peccatis sacrificio expiatorio satisfaciat, ac deinde pro nobis apud illam interpellet. *Redemptio*, ut secundum regiam suam potestatem nos

Christ is in fact the medial, or mediating, cause*[25] for the preservation of the good angels, yet who go on to state that Christ should not therefore be called their Mediator.[26]

For in Holy Scripture Christ is never called the Mediator of his elect when 35
it concerns their preservation; but he is always called their Mediator when it concerns their reconciliation with the God whom they offended. For there neither was, nor will be, any dissension between God and the good angels. It was not the angels whom Christ took upon himself, but the seed of Abraham, so that like a propitiator interceding between two differing parties—between God his Father according to his divine nature* and us his brothers according to the flesh he had assumed from the seed of Abraham—he might in himself restore us into his Father's grace (Hebrews 2:16).

Therefore, when the sacred letters sometimes call the blessed angels God's 36
sons or chosen ones, we should take it to mean that they, having been chosen by the almighty hand of Christ their head and ruler according to the abiding grace* of divine election, are preserved in the original state and truth which they received through him. And so, remaining in that state unaltered, they may have the blessing of seeing God face to face for ever (Job 1:6, and 2:1; 1 Timothy 5:21; Colossians 2:10; Hebrews 12:22; John 8:44; Jude 6).

The form of the mediatorial office is clearly evident from the three parts and 37
functions he alone performed by himself: prophet, priest, and king.[27]

Because those three functions can be discerned together only in Christ, it 38
says that it was he whom God made to be our wisdom, justice, sanctification and redemption (1 Corinthians 1:30). He was made our wisdom in order to turn us by his prophetic instruction from being foolish at heart into wise unto salvation. He was made our righteousness and sanctification, so that by the two-fold nature of his priestly office he first might render satisfaction to the aggrieved divine majesty through his atoning sacrifice for our sins, and next to intercede with this majesty on our behalf. He was made redemption for us so that by his kingly power he might keep us (who have been released from our

25 The 'medial cause' is the instrumental cause through which an end is accomplished.

26 See also *SPT* 12.33. As thesis 35 explains, the mediation by Christ consists of reconciliation, and this does not apply to the angels who have stayed obedient. In the discussion with Arminius, Franciscus Junius had stated that Christ was also the Mediator of the obedient angels; see Arminius, *Works* 3:137.

27 An early statement of the threefold office of Christ as Prophet, Priest, and King is found in Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, 1.3.8 (NPNF2, 1:86). John Calvin structured his discussion of Christ's mediatorial work on this triad; see *Institutes*, 2.15. The notion of the threefold issue occurs also in *Heidelberg Catechism*, Question and Answer 31.

a servitute peccati liberatos freno suae disciplinae in officio contineat, suoque praesidio ab omni hostium injuria custodiat.

XXXIX Prophetia est functio qua Christus populum suum in veritate doctrinae legalis et Evangelicae instituit, atque utramque miraculis obsignatam a falsorum Doctorum corruptelis repurgat, tum per se ipsum immediate,* tum per alios verbi sui administros donis ad eam rem necessariis instructos, mediate;* quorum priores, synecdochice* Prophetarum, posteriores, Apostolorum nomine comprehenduntur, Matt. 5, 2. et sequentibus. Joh. 17, 8.

XL Populus Dei, quem prophetiae Christi objectum facimus, est vel sub Veteri, vel sub Novo Testamento considerandus. Sub illo omnes ferme erant Judaei, sub hoc partim Judaei, partim Gentiles. Illi in sapientiae divinae institutione his fuerunt praepositi, ut promissiones Abrahae ceterisque Patriarchis factae in filiis eorum circumcisis primo loco implerentur. Quae causa* est cur et Christus minister circumcisionis potissimum oves perditas domus Israëlis ad se vocaverit, Matt. 15, 24. Rom. 15, 8. His aeque atque illis post Christi ascensionem ad coelos Evangelium ipsius per Apostolos annunciatum fuit, ut ipse non solum esset gloria populi Israëlis, sed et lux Gentium, juxta vaticinia, Es. 49, 6. Luc. 2, 32.

XLI Modum* institutionis Propheticae duplicem statuimus, immediatum* et mediatum.* Priore Christus plerumque usus est, aut secundum divinam tantum naturam* sub veteri foedere erga Prophetas, aut secundum utramque erga Apostolos. Utrosque enim sol ille justitiae, radiis luminis Prophetici quod in se habet, suapte virtute illustravit. Posteriore usus est, cum servis suis Prophetis atque Apostolis imperavit, ut populo suo omnia sapientiae suae mysteria ad salutem scitu necessaria, tum concionibus, tum scriptis suis patefacerent. Qua Ecclesia Dei mota consideratione omnes traditiones repudiat, quae sacro Codice non continentur. Priore docendi modo,* et mentes hominum absque posterioris adminiculo intus illustrati, et corda ipsorum ad fidei obedientiam inflecti possunt. Posteriore neutrum eorum effectum absque prioris subsidio produci potest.

XLII Sacerdotium Christi est functio qua coram Dei apparet, ut legem ab ipso acceptam nostro nomine observet, seipsum victimam reconciliationis pro

slavery to sin) within the boundaries of our calling by the restraining reins of his control; and so that by his protection he might keep us safe from all harm done by the enemy.

Prophecy is the function whereby Christ establishes his people in the right 39
doctrines of the Law and the Gospel; sealed by his wonders, each of these doctrines is cleansed from the corruptions of the false teachers. Sometimes he does this by himself directly,* at other times indirectly,* through other servants of his Word who have been endowed with gifts needed for that purpose. Of these the former are included by synecdoche* under the name 'prophets' and the latter 'apostles' (Matthew 5:2 ff., John 17:8).

We should consider the people of God, whom we regard as the object of 40
Christ's prophetic work, under the Old and the New Testament. Under the former nearly all were Jews, while under the latter they were partly Jews and partly Gentiles. The former had been preferred to the latter in the teaching of divine wisdom, so that the promises made to Abraham and the other patriarchs might in the first place be fulfilled in their circumcised sons. For this reason* also Christ as the minister of circumcision called to himself especially the lost sheep of the house of Israel (Matthew 15:24, Romans 15:8). It was after Christ's ascension into heaven that the apostles declared the Gospel of Christ equally to Jews and Gentiles, so that Christ might be not only the glory of the people of Israel, but also the light to the Gentiles, according to the prophecies in Isaiah 49:6 and Luke 2:32.

In our opinion the prophetic teaching uses two means,* immediate* and 41
mediate.* For the most part Christ made use of the former means, either by only his divine nature* for the prophets in the old covenant, or by both natures for the apostles. For he, the Sun of righteousness, with the rays of prophetic light that it possesses, shone powerfully upon both [prophets and apostles]. He made use of the latter means when he commanded his prophets and apostles in their speaking and writing to unfold to his people all the secrets of his wisdom that they must know for salvation. With this in mind, the Church of God was moved to reject every tradition that is not contained in the holy book.[28] In the former [immediate] mode* of teaching, the minds of men can be thoroughly enlightened without the help of the latter means, and their hearts could be bent to the obedience of faith. In the latter [mediate] mode, neither of these results can be effected without the help of the former means.

Christ's priesthood is the function wherein he appears before God's presence 42
in order to keep the Law (that he had received from him) in our name, to

28 See also *SPT* 4, "On the Perfection of Scripture, and the Futility of Adding Unwritten Traditions to it."

nostris peccatis ipsi offerat, suaque apud eum intercessione opem ipsius perennem ac donationem Spiritus Sancti nobis impetret atque efficaciter applicet, Heb. 10.7, 8. et seq.

XLIII Haec triplex coram Deo veniendi ratio per summum Sacerdotem Leviticum olim fuit adumbrata, qui juxta Dei mandatum, tabulas legis in arca foederis repositas asservabat, ac pro populo cum victimarum et precum oblatione se tamquam Mediatorem Deo sistebat.

XLIV Idem Christi Sacerdotium olim quoque fuit Melchisedeciano, sed alio fine,* praefiguratum, nimirum, ut illius praestantiam prae Levitico ex triplici praerogativa denotaret, 1. aeternitatis, cum, ut Melchisedecus typice, sic Christus secundum rei* veritatem absque patre et matre, absque ortu et interitu Dei Sacerdos nuncupatur. 2. duplicis officii, cum uterque Regis et Sacerdotis titulo insignitur. 3. eminentiae supra ordinem Leviticum, cum a Melchisedeco ipse Levi in Abrahamo, in cujus erat lumbis, decimatus fuisse dicitur, Heb. 7, 3. 9.

XLV Legem Dei Christus duobus modis* implevit, generali scilicet omnium mandatorum Dei observatione, et poenarum quibus nos miseri peccatores secundum legis comminationem obnoxii eramus, voluntaria persolutione. Utraque legis impletio in sequentibus disputationibus de Christi satisfactione et nostri justificatione fusius explicabitur.

XLVI Sacrificium Christi, tum ratione τοῦ λόγου victimam offerentis, tum ratione carnis, seu victimae oblatae, a Sacerdotibus et sacrificiis Leviticis per Apostolum in Epistola ad Hebraeos his notis distinguitur.

1. Quod persona* offerens sit unicus Sacerdos secundum ordinem Melchisedeci in perpetuum permanens, ideoque nullum alium ad muneris sui societatem, aut successionem admittat, Heb. 7, 3.
2. Quod hic Sacerdos per se sit inculpatus atque ab omnibus peccatoribus separatus, Heb. 7, 26.
3. Quod oblatio ipsius semel facta sit omnibus numeris sufficiens ad nos perfecte servandos, atque ideo nunquam iteranda, Heb. 7, 24. 25.
4. Quod caro, seu victima oblata, sit cum τῷ λόγῳ eam offerente personaliter* unita, Heb. 9, 12.
5. Quod vigor hujus victimae ac valor apud Deum sit sempiternus, Heb. 7, 24. 25. et 10, 14.

XLVII Qua Apostoli quintuplici distinctione traditiones Pontificiorum de Pontificis sui, tamquam vicarii Jesu Christi, primatu, et de Missae sacrificio per secundarios Novi Testamenti Sacerdotes Deo etiamnum offerendo, funditus

present himself to him as the victim of reconciliation for our sins, and by his intercession with him to obtain for us his constant help and the gift of the Holy Spirit, and to apply them to us effectively (Hebrews 10:7 ff.).

43 This three-fold way of coming into God's presence was foreshadowed in former times by the Levitic high priest, who by God's command watched over the tables of the Law that had been placed in the ark of the covenant, and who stood before God on behalf of the people like a mediator accompanied by the offerings of sacrifices and prayers.[29]

44 The same priesthood of Christ was formerly prefigured also by the priesthood of Melchizedek, albeit for a different goal,* i.e., to demonstrate that its excellence surpassed the Levitic priesthood by these three advantages: 1) its eternal duration, since, like Melchizedek figuratively, Christ in true reality* is called a priest to God who is without father and mother, and without beginning and end; 2) its double office, since both are distinguished by the titles of 'King' and 'Priest;' 3) its preeminence over the Levitic order, since it is said that Levi himself, while he was yet in the loins of Abraham, gave tithes to Melchizedek (Hebrews 7:3, 9).

45 Christ fulfilled the Law of God in two ways:* by generally observing all of God's commandments, and by voluntarily discharging the penalties we wretched sinners were liable to undergo as the Law had warned. We shall give more copious explanations of both fulfillments of the Law in the subsequent disputations about Christ's satisfaction and our justification.[30]

46 In the letter to the Hebrews the apostle distinguishes the sacrifice of Christ (who is the Word that offers the sacrificial victim, and the flesh or victim that is offered) from the Levitic priests and their sacrifices with the following points: 1) Because the person* who is making the offer is a special priest in the order of Melchizedek who remains forever and so permits no-one else to share his office with him nor to succeed him (Hebrews 7:3). 2) Because this priest is blameless in himself and set apart from all sinners (Hebrews 7:26). 3) Because the offering of himself that was made once is sufficient in every way to preserve us perfectly, and so it is never to be repeated (Hebrews 7:24, 25). 4) Because the flesh or sacrificial victim that was offered is united in person* to the Word that offers it (Hebrews 9:12). 5) Because for God the value and force of this sacrificial victim is everlasting (Hebrews 7:24, 25, and 10:14).

47 The apostle's five-part distinction completely overturns the traditions of the papal theologians about the primacy of their pope as the vicar of Jesus Christ, and about the sacrifice of the mass that is to be offered to God still

29 See, for instance, Leviticus 16 and Hebrews 9.

30 See *SPT* 29 and 33.

evertuntur. Haec utique axiomata sunt ἀσύστατα, seque invicem evertentia; *Christum solum nostrum esse Pontificem: Papam interim Romanum ipsius esse vicarium*. Item, *Sacrificium Christi cruentum, quod per Spiritum suum aeternum in propria sua carne Deo semel obtulit, tantummodo esse expiatorium; Et, Missae sacrificium incruentum, quod sacrificuli per Spiritum suum humanum in aliena, nempe Christi, ut putant, carne Deo offerunt, similiter esse expiatorium* Adhaec, *Sacrificium expiatorium proprie* sic dictum, non potuisse Deo olim offerri ab hominibus mortalibus et peccato obnoxiis sub Veteri Testamento, ac propterea a solo Filio Dei Patri suo, quoad essentialem* immortalitatem ac sanctitatem coaequali, offerri debuisse: Nunc vero ab hujusmodi hominibus, quales erant Sacerdotes sub Veteri Testamento, sacrificium vere expiatorium et debere et posse offerri*. Et similia, quae postea plenius excutientur.

XLVIII Intercessio Christi est functio, qua se in Sacrario coelesti sistens Deo Patri, tum misericordiam ipsius ac remissionem peccatorum merito sacrificii sui expiatorii impetratam, tum opem ipsius ac dona Spiritus Sancti nostro nomine efflagitat, quibus indies magis ac magis ad omnia obedientiae atque εὐχαριστίας officia parati reddamur.

XLIX Fit illa intercessio a Filio Dei secundum voluntariam gratiae* dispensationem* ac rationem mediationi suae convenientem, non quod jam statu suae exinanitionis deposito, flexis genibus, ante Patrem suum in coelis devolvatur, sed quia instar sacerdotis atque advocati se in conspectu ipsius sistens, non minus ardenter, secundum naturam* suam humanam, quam efficaciter secundum divinam ab ipso gratiae atque opis nobis necessariae continuationem postulat.

L Non magis haec Christi intercessio cum sanctis Angelis ac beatorum hominum Spiritibus, quam sacrificii ipsius oblatio cum Sacrificulis Romanensibus communicari potest.* Nam sicuti redemptionis, sic et intercessionis solus Mediator est, ac proinde Pontificii qui sanctos Angelos atque homines hac vita

today by the secondary priests of the New Testament. The following statements of principle are entirely inconsistent and contradict one another: that Christ is our only High-priest, but meanwhile the Roman pope is his vicar. That the bloody sacrifice which Christ offered in his own flesh once and for all to God through his eternal Spirit is the only one that makes atonement,[31] but meanwhile the bloodless sacrifice of the mass, which by their own human spirit the sacrificers offer in the flesh of another (namely Christ's flesh, as they think) is also an atoning sacrifice. Moreover, that in former times men who were mortal and subject to sin could not have offered the atoning sacrifice (in the strict sense* of the word) to God in the Old Testament, and that therefore only the Son of God should have offered it, as he is equal with the Father in his essential* immortality and holiness; but [they say] nowadays men of the sort that the priests were in the Old Testament should and are able to offer a truly atoning sacrifice. And similar statements, which will be examined more fully afterwards.[32]

The intercession by Christ is the function whereby Christ takes his place in 48
the heavenly sanctuary and pleads earnestly on our behalf with God the Father for his mercy and the forgiveness of sins that he obtained by the merit of his atoning sacrifice. He also pleads for his help and the gifts of the Holy Spirit, whereby daily we are rendered better equipped for all the duties of obedience and gratitude.[33]

The Son of God brings this intercession about by a voluntarily administered* 49
grace* and in a manner that befits his mediatorial work, not because he now, after having put off his state of self-renunciation,[34] falls upon bended knees before his Father in heaven, but because like a priest or advocate he takes his place and face to face with him earnestly requests that he continue to grant his grace and the help we need, no less ardently in his human nature* than effectively in his divine nature.

It is no more possible* for Christ's intercession to be communicated to the 50
holy angels or the souls of people in heaven than his sacrificial offer can be communicated to the Roman sacrificers. For he is the sole Mediator of the redemption as well as the intercession, and so the papal theologians who link

31 On 'atonement' see the notes at theses 3 and 7 above.

32 See *SPT* 46, "On the Offering of the Mass and its Abuses."

33 Note that the Greek word *eucharistia* is used here for 'gratitude.'

34 Self-renunciation (*exinanitio*) is the relinquishing of the form of God by Christ, and the assumption of the form of a servant (Philippians 2:5–7). According to Reformed theology, it is the preincarnate Christ, the Word that is yet to become flesh, who relinquishes the divine glory. See *DLGTT*, s.v. "exinanitio," and cf. *SPT* 25.5,14,24 and 27.3.

defunctos, Christo, tamquam secundarios intercessores associant, non exigua ipsum injuria afficiunt, ut deinceps, Deo dante, declarabitur.

LI Regium Christi munus est, quo Ecclesiam sanguine suo acquisitam, tamquam unicum illius caput, gubernat, atque adversus omnes hostes tam internos, quam externos, potenter tuetur, suoque ductu in hoc pulvere militantem idoneis armis instruit, ut tandem promissae victoriae particeps facta, cum ipso in coelis de hostibus debellatis perpetuum triumphum agat, Deumque de hac parta victoria indesinenter celebret. Solus enim Christus, et ordinis dignitate, et regendi, vegetandi, conservandique virtute, et donorum spiritualium multitudine ac perfectione,* super omnia mystici sui corporis membra singulari modo* atque infinito* eminet, Rom. 8, 29. Col. 1, 18. Joh. 3, 34. ut hoc *in disputatione 41. de Christo unico Ecclesiae capite*, adversus Pontificios expresse demonstrabitur,* qui Christum universalem Ecclesiae suae gubernationem, in unum Petrum, tamquam in vicarium suum, deinde Petrum eandem gubernationem, in unum Pontificem Romanum, tamquam in successorem suum legitimum, contulisse falso affirmant.

LII Ceterum ut Ecclesiae Christi duplex est status, unus gratiae in hoc seculo, alter gloriae in futuro, ita praesens Ecclesiae gubernatio a futura est distinguenda. In hac enim vita Christus Ecclesiam suam mediate* regit per Ecclesiasticam fidelium pastorum, ac protegit per politicam piorum Magistratuum administrationem; in altera vita eam immediate* absque ejusmodi externis adminiculis reget secundum Deitatem sibi cum Patre et Spiritu Sancto communem,* ut cum utroque sit omnia in omnibus fidei domesticis, quos proxima jucundissimaque sui visione ac communitate in coelis beabit, 1 Cor. 15, 28. Apoc. 21, 22. 23.

LIII Hinc Christus, ubi omnes suos electos sibi unitate consummatae fidei agglutinatos, et ab hostium metu plene liberatos tradiderit, ipsi suum quoque

the holy angels and men departed from this life to Christ as his secondary intercessors, do him no small harm—as will be made clear in a later [disputation], if God shall grant it.[35]

In his office as king, Christ, as its only Head, governs the Church that was pur- 51
chased with his own blood,[36] and he powerfully guards her against every enemy within and without. By his guidance he equips her with suitable weapons as she battles in the 'arena' of this world, so that when at long last she is made partaker of the victory he promised, she celebrates in heaven with him an eternal triumph over her defeated enemies, and without stopping praises God for the victory obtained. For only Christ stands out far above all the members of his mystic body in this unique and boundless* way;* he does so by the worthiness of his rank and his power to rule, enliven, and preserve her, and also by the amount of perfect* spiritual gifts (Romans 8:29, Colossians 1:18, John 3:34). And in Disputation 41, "On Christ the Only Head of the Church,"[37] we shall demonstrate* this explicitly over against the papal theologians, who make the false claim that Christ bestowed the world-wide government over his Church to Peter as his vicar alone, and that Peter in turn handed that same government over to the one Roman pope as his lawful successor.

But as Christ's Church has a twofold state, the one of grace in this age and the 52
other of glory in the future, we should distinguish the current government of the Church from the one that is to come. For in this life Christ rules his Church through the intervening* agencies of ecclesiastical administration by faithful pastors, and he protects it by the administration of devout political magistrates. In the life that is to come he will rule it directly,* without the external supports of that kind and by the divinity he shares* with the Father and the Holy Spirit, so that together with them he may be all things to every member of the household of faith, whom he shall cause to rejoice in beholding him and communicating with him most closely and happily (1 Corinthians 15:28; Revelation 21, 22 and 23).

Hence it says that when Christ will hand over to God all the elect who clung 53
to him in the unity of perfected faith and who have been freed completely

35 See *SPT* 36.9–20 below. The remark 'if God shall grant it' reminds the reader the text originated as a cycle of disputations that still had to be completed.

36 Acts 20:28.

37 In the original catalogue of 1620 the intended title of disputation 41 was *De Christo unico Ecclesiae Capite et de Antichristo* as Polyander refers to it here, without the Antichrist. In the title of the disputation 41 *unico* was deleted. For the original catalogue see Sinnema and Van den Belt, "The *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* (1625) as a Disputation Cycle," 532–533.

sceptrum mediatorium seu oeconomicum* traditurus dicitur, ut imperium mere divinum eadem gloria ac majestate cum Patre, erga suos electos in aeternum exerceat, quam ab aeterno cum ipso habuit, 1 Cor. 15, 24. 26. etc.

LIV Sceptri illius mediatorii traditio fiet extremi judicii die, postquam Christus, secundum judicandi potestatem personalem* sibi a Patre datam, amicis suis ex gratia* immerita praemium vitae, hostibus vero ex ultione merita supplicium mortis aeternae adjudicaverit.

from their fear of the enemy, he will also hand over to him his mediatorial (or dispensational*) scepter so that he may forever conduct his purely divine reign over his elect with the same glory and majesty that he shared with the Father from eternity (1 Corinthians 15:24, 26).

Handing over that mediatorial scepter will happen on the day of the last 54
judgment, after Christ, by the personal* power of judging which the Father has granted him, and by an act of grace* undeserved, will bestow on his friends the reward of life, while with vengeance deserved he will give to his enemies the punishment of eternal death.[38]

38 See further disputation 51, "On the Resurrection of the Flesh and the Ultimate Judgment."

DISPUTATIO XXVII

De Statu Humiliationis Christi[a]

Praeside D. ANDREA RIVETO
Respondente SAMUELE RIVETO

THESIS I Redemptionis nostrae necessitas* ex iis quae de lapsu primi parentis, peccati propagatione, et legis divinae exactione, hactenus dicta sunt, adeo perspicue demonstrata* est, ut a nemine in dubium possit revocari, nisi ab eo qui peccati et maledictionis aeternae sensu nullo tangitur. Sed nihil actum esset, nisi etiam nobis innotuisset ille in quo,[b] qui in se ipsis damnati, mortui et perditi sunt, justitiam, liberationem, vitam et salutem quaererent. Itaque de Christo aeterno Dei Filio, in tempore homine facto, tamquam proxima* efficiente redemptionis hujus nostrae causa,* respectu personae* in qua duae naturae* coeunt, et respectu officii mediatorii, in genere vel per partes considerati, hactenus disputatum est.

II Superest ut de modo* et ratione agamus, qua abolitis peccatis Christus dissidium inter Deum et nos sustulit, justitiam acquisivit, quae eum nobis faventem et benevolum redderet, eam nobis quotidie efficaciter applicando;[c] atque ita *Salvatoris* nomen ipsi a Deo per Angelum impositum, Matt. 1, 21. generet, et rem* nomine significatam,* ipso facto praestaret. Hic modus aut ratio in duplici mediatoris statu consideratur, nempe *humiliationis et exaltationis*, in quibus

[a] The original disputation was published as Andreas Rivetus, *Disputationum theologicarum vigesima-septima, de statu humiliationis Iesu Christi*, resp. Samuel Rivetus (Leiden: Isaac Elzevir, 1622) and was dated March 19, 1622. [b] nisi etiam is nobis innotuisset in quo: original disputation. [c] ut eam nobis quotidie efficaciter applicaret: original disputation. The English translation follows this reading.

DISPUTATION 27

On Christ in his State of Humiliation

President: Andreas Rivetus
Respondent: Samuel Rivetus[1]

From what we have said thus far about the fall of our first parent, the propagation of sin, and the demands of God's Law, we have demonstrated* that the need* for our redemption is so obvious that no-one can question it unless he remains unaffected by every feeling of guilt and eternal damnation. Yet this [realization] would have no benefit, were it not for the fact that we also have come to know him in whom all who are cursed, dead, and lost in themselves should seek their righteousness, freedom, life, and salvation. And therefore up to this point we also have provided disputations about Christ the eternal Son of God, who in time was made man—the proximate* efficient cause* of our redemption—as regards his person* in whom the two natures* come together, and as regards his mediatorial office (viewed generally or in its parts).[2] 1

What remains for us is to treat the way* or manner whereby Christ removed the division between God and us by completely taking away our sins and obtained the righteousness which renders God favorable and well-disposed towards us, so that he might apply it to us effectively every day, and thus might bear the name 'Savior' bestowed on him by God through the angel in Matthew 1:21 and in actual fact* perform what that name implies.* One can examine this way (or manner) in our Mediator's two states—the state of humiliation 2

1 Born c. 1599 in Thouars (France), Samuel Rivetus studied theology in Saumur and Geneva. He came to Leiden in 1620 together with his father Andreas and his younger brother Claudius. He matriculated with his brother on October 1, 1620, *honoris causa*, and with their father as a professor in theology. He defended this disputation on March 19, 1622, and dedicated it with a long letter to Henri III de La Trémoille (1598–1674), duke of Thouars and La Trémoille, and Prince of Talmond and Taranto. Called to the ministry in Melle in the French province of Poitou, Samuel died before he was ordained in Leiden in 1629; see Du Rieu, *Album studiosorum*, 149. See also Huibert Jacob Honders, *Andreas Rivetus als invloedrijk gereformeerd theoloog in Holland's bloeitijd* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1930), 19, 176–177; Alexander Gijsbert van Opstal, *André Rivet. Een invloedrijk hugenoot aan het hof van Frederik Hendrik* (Harderwijk: [s.n.], 1937), 144, 146, 156; and Christiaan Sepp, *Het godgeleerd onderwijs in Nederland, gedurende de 16e en 17e eeuw* (Leiden: De Breuk en Smits, 1873–1874), 2:32.

2 This thesis connects this disputation on Christ's redemptive work to the disputations on the fall and sin (*SPT* 14–16) on the Law (*SPT* 18), and to the two preceding ones on the natures and on the office of Christ (*SPT* 25–26).

tota illa salutis nostrae dispensatio,* et triplicis officii Christi exsecutio consistit.

III De hoc statu humiliationis ut nunc dicamus, ordinis ratio* postulat. Quo nomine* in genere, intelligitur tota illa oeconomia,* qua Christus *accepta forma servi, Patri fuit obediens usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis*, Phil. 2, 7. et lata significatione totam Filii incarnati humilitatem, omnesque ejus gradus comprehendit; proprie* vero extremam illam submissionem, seu ultimum vitae actum* usque ad mortem, quae vulgo, etiam recepta in Scripturis significatione, κατ᾽ ἐξοχὴν, *passio* appellatur.

IV De hac postrema nobis instituenda est disputatio, cujus gradus tres considerantur: I. Crucifixionis antecedanea cum ipsa crucifixione et subsequente morte. II. Sepultura. III. Descensus ad inferos. Passionis hujus initium proprie* a captivitate sumimus, etiamsi quae ante ipsi acciderunt, et quae προπάθειαι aliis dicuntur, huc referri possint et debeant, quando obedientiae illius partem faciunt, quae in suo complemento intelligitur; cujus rei causa,* in symbolo fidei, a Christi natalibus, fit transitus ad mortem quae reliquam obedientiam secum trahit.

V Crucifixionis praecedanea fuerunt, Judae proditio, Christi captivitas, deductio ad Sacerdotum consessum, variae derisiones; traditio in manus gentium, Pilati nominatim; ejusdem sub Pilato examen, flagellatio, condemnatio denique, quam subsecutum est supplicium ignominiosissimum crucis, qui violentae ejus mortis modus fuit, ut fieret *maledictum* et *execratio*, idque non humana tantum opinione, sed divinae legis decreto, pronuntiantis, *execrabilem esse qui in ligno pendet* (Deut. 21, 23. Gal. 3, 13.) quod praeterea acerbissimum fuit, et cum summis doloribus conjunctum, quia in membris maxime nervosis, et exquisito sensu praeditis, scilicet manibus et pedibus confixus, sic aliquandiu cum diuturno dolore totus pependit.

and of exaltation—wherein the entire dispensation* for our salvation and the execution of Christ's three-fold office reside.[3]

3 Logical* order demands that we now speak about this state of humiliation. In general this word* ['humiliation'] means the entire economy* with which Christ, "by taking on the form of a servant, was obedient to the Father unto death, even death on the cross" (Philippians 2:7[–8]). And in an extended sense it means the entire humility of the Son in all its degrees; but in the proper sense* it means that final act of subjection, that last deed* of life to the point of death, which commonly is referred to specifically as his 'passion,' with a meaning that is found commonly also in the Scriptures.

4 In the disputation that we must set forth about this last point, the passion of Christ, we consider three steps: 1) what preceded the crucifixion, along with the crucifixion itself and the death that followed it; 2) the burial; 3) the descent into hell.[4] We take the starting-point of this passion in its proper sense* from the time of his capture, although the things that happened to him earlier (and which others call 'pre-passions')[5] could and should be included in it, since they make up a portion of that obedience when taken as a whole. It is for this reason* that the Apostles' Creed moves from the birth of Christ to his death, because the latter entails the other acts of obedience.

5 [The sufferings] that preceded Christ's crucifixion were: the betrayal of Judas; his capture; handing him over to the meeting of the priests; the different acts of derision; delivering him into the hands of heathens (particularly Pilate); his interrogation, flogging, and lastly condemnation under Pilate, followed by the most shameful punishment of the cross which was the means of his violent death, so that he would become "the accursed and the curse," not just in the opinion of humans only but by order of the Law of God, which declares: "Accursed is everyone who hangs on a tree" (Deuteronomy 21:23; Galatians 3:13). Moreover, it was a most horrible form of punishment, one that was accompanied by very great pain because he was pierced in those limbs that are particularly sensitive and endowed with exceptional feeling—his hands and feet—and in this manner he hung there entirely in constant pain for some time.

---

3 The phrasing that Christ executes his office in the states of humiliation and exaltation became standard in Reformed Orthodoxy. See for example the *Westminster Shorter Catechism*, Question and Answer 23.

4 The three steps correspond to the three steps of Christ's exaltation; see *SPT* 28.2.

5 The term is often used to refer to Christ's suffering in Gethsemane. Jerome taught that no passion held sway over Christ's soul, but that his sorrow was a "preliminary suffering" (*propassio*) because Christ only began to be sorrowful. See Jerome, *Commentary on Matthew* 26:37 (CCSL 77:253); cf. Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 3.15.4.

VI Praeter gravissimos illos cruciatus corporis *intimum animi dolorem summum fuisse in Christo*, ne Catechismus quidem Romanus negat (in 4. artic. symbol.)[a] *Animam ejus apprehendisse omnes tristitiae causas, fatetur* Aquinas (part. 3. q. 46. artic. 5. et 6.)[b] *omnemque assumpsisse tristitiam, maximam quantitate absoluta*, nempe cum non solum in se contumelias, opprobria, flagra et ignominiosa supplicia ad mortem usque pertulit; sed etiam ardorem inimicitiae, iraeque Dei adversus homines, patientia, obsequio atque durissimae castigationis toleratione placavit. Quae adeo horrenda et acerba fuerunt, ut vel aestimatione ipsa et agitatione mentis, metum summum et tristitiam in horto contraxerit, precibus conditionatis poculum illud deprecatus sit, sudorem tamquam sanguinis grumos emiserit, Angelicae consolationis usum non detrectaverit, et in cruce se a Patre derelictum exclamaverit, Matt. 26, 37. et 38. Marc. 14, 33. 34. Matt. 26, 39. 42. 44. Marc. 14, 36. 39. Luc. 22, 42. 43. 44. Matt. 27, 46.

VII Cum enim in locum sceleratorum sponsorem se et vadem submisisset, dependere atque persolvere debuit omnes, quae ab illis erant exigendae,[c] poenas, ac proinde cum inferorum copiis, et aeternae mortis horrore, quasi consertis manibus luctari, et non modo corpus suum redemptionis pretium tradere, sed etiam in anima sua, diros cruciatus pati, cum se ad tribunal Dei stare cognosceret nostra causa.

VIII Hisce doloribus non solum naturali morte, sed etiam supernaturali* quodam modo defunctus est; *affectione commodi* a Deo separatus, non *affectione justitiae*, non separata quidem divinitate ratione unionis hypostaticae,* sed divina virtute in eo sese ad momentum occultante, ut in tanta necessitate, nulla appareret virtutis divinae exhibitio, nulla esset majestatis ostensio.[d] Quae

---

[a] Pedro Rodríguez and Ildefonso Adeva (eds.) *Catechismus Romanus seu Catechismus ex decreto Concilii Tridentini ad parochos Pii V pont. max. iussu editus* (Vatican City: Officina Libraria Vaticana, 1989), 65, article 4.13. [b] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 3.46.6. [c] expetendae: original disputation. [d] offensio: 1642. The preference for the reading *ostensio* over *offensio* is supported by the allusion to Bernard of Clairvaux; see the corresponding note with the translation.

In addition to those very grievous torments of the body Christ suffered also 6
the deepest anguish of the soul, as even the Roman Catechism states (Article 4, on the Symbols).[6] Aquinas grants that Christ's soul experienced everything that causes grief ([*Summa theologiae*], part 3, question 46, article 5 and 6), and he took upon himself every sorrow, the greatest grief in absolute quantity, and all the way to the point of death he not only bore in himself the slanderings, tauntings, scourgings, and shameful humiliations, but with patience, humility, and while enduring his harshest chastisement, he also appeased the wrath and anger of God that burned against mankind. These sufferings were so terribly bitter that when he weighed and turned them over in his mind, he was overcome by the greatest fear and sorrow in the garden; he prayed that conditioned prayer to take away 'the cup,'[7] perspired sweat like drops of blood, did not shy away from using an angel to comfort him, and declared on the cross that he had been forsaken by the Father (Matthew 26:37 and 38; Mark 14:33, 34; Matthew 26:39, 42, 44; Mark 14:36, 39; Luke 22:42, 43, and 44; Matthew 27:46).

For because he had offered himself as surety and pledge in the place of 7
sinners, he had to pay in full and clear away all the penalties that they should have borne, and so he had to wrestle (as in a hand-to-hand combat) with the forces of hell and with the horror of everlasting death; and he had to give not only his own body as a ransom for deliverance, but he even suffered dreadful torments in his soul, since he knew that he was standing before the judgment seat of God on our behalf.

With these sorrows he died not only a natural* death, but in some sense also 8
a supernatural* death.[8] He was separated from God in terms of willing what is pleasant, though not in terms of willing what is righteous.[9] To be sure, he was not separated from his Godhead as far as the union in Person* is concerned, but the divine power in him hid itself for the time being, so that in his great need there was no display of divine power, and there was no manifestation

6 The phrasing may reflect the medieval tendency to attribute impassibility to the soul of Christ, over against which the Catechism of Trent states that Christ in his soul experienced a most acute sense of pain.

7 The prayer is called 'conditioned' because Christ prayed for this only if it would be possible.

8 Natural death is the separation of body and soul, supernatural death the separation from God.

9 The scholastic distinction within the will between the *affectio commodi* and the *affectio iustitiae* is here applied to the love of God for Christ. In willing what is righteous the agent seeks the intrinsic goodness of things for their own sake and not simply for his own pleasure as is the case in willing what is pleasant, an inclination toward the agent's perfection, which is happiness. In human beings the *affectio iustitiae* serves as a check on the immoderate love of the *affectio commodi*.

derelictio ad poenas infernales peccatoribus debitas referri debet. Ideo de Christo intelliguntur[a] loci illi, in quibus Propheta typice conqueritur, *circumdatum se fuisse doloribus inferni, animam suam repletam fuisse malis*, et *vitam ad infernum appropinquasse*. Et tandem agnoscit, *Deum redemisse animam suam ab inferno inferiori*, Ps. 18, 5. Ps. 116, 3. Ps. 83, 3. Ps. 86, 16.

IX Dicimus tamen, eum *extremitatem* poenae passum esse, non *aeternitatem*, et in illa passione animae, nihil ἔσωθεν quod Scholastici* dicunt ab *intrinseco*, fuisse in Christo inordinatum, etsi ἔξωθεν, *ab extrinseco*, impetitus fuerit; inde sequitur, a damnatione illa *absoluta* immunem fuisse, in qua manent, qui propter sua ipsorum peccata, aeternis poenis mancipantur, in quibus mors illa cum desperatione conjuncta est; quam ut Christo tribuamus, absit, etsi hoc nomine ab adversariis calumniam patiamur.

X Imo etiam quaecunque sive in corpore, sive in anima pertulit Christus, cum Damasceno[b] ad illam οἰκείωσιν, *appropriationem*, referimus; non quae est φυσικὴ καὶ οὐσιώδης, secundum quam naturam* nostram, et naturalia* cuncta assumpsit; sed quae προσωπικὴ καὶ σχετικὴ, qua nostram subinde personam, secundum quam maledictionem et derelictionem nostram ᾠκειώσατο, appropriavit sibi, τὸ ἡμέτερον ἀναδεχόμενος πρόσωπον, ut ait idem Damasc. (*Orthod. fid.*

[a] referuntur: original disputation. [b] John of Damascus, *De fide orthodoxa* 3.25 (MPG 94:1093).

of majesty.[10] This abandonment of Christ to hellish punishments should be associated with the punishments that were due to us sinners. Therefore those places [in Scripture] should be taken as referring to Christ, where the prophet as a type [of Christ][11] complains that "he was surrounded by the sorrows of hell," "his soul was overcome with troubles," and that "his life had come to the brink of death." And in the end he acknowledges that "God has redeemed his soul from the depths of hell" (Psalm 18:5; 116:3; 83:3; 86:16).

Moreover, we state that while he did suffer punishment to the extreme 9
degree, he did not suffer punishment for eternity, and in that suffering of the soul deep within Christ (what the Scholastics* call 'intrinsically') there was nothing inordinate, while he was being assailed outwardly ([what they call] 'extrinsically').[12] From this it follows that he was not affected by that complete damnation wherein those people will abide who because of their own sins will be bound with punishments for ever; death of that kind is accompanied by the loss of all hope. Far be it from us to ascribe that kind of death to Christ, even if we should suffer from the insults of our opponents on account of it.[13]

In fact, along with John of Damascus, we refer everything that Christ suffered 10
(whether in body or in soul) to what he called his *oikeiōsis*, or appropriation. This appropriation is not the natural* or essential one (whereby he assumed our nature* and all things natural), but it is personal and relative, whereby he immediately after that appropriated our person* to himself, in which he made our curse and forsakenness his own—"receiving our person" (as the same John of Damascus[14] puts it, *An Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, book 3

10 Rivetus here echoes Bernard of Clairvaux, *Dominica in Kalendis Novembris Sermo 5*, which states that in Christ's "great need there was no display of power, no manifestation of majesty," Bernard de Clairvaux, Josef Schwarzbauer (ed.) *Sämtliche Werke* (Innsbruck: Tyrolia-Verlag, 1990–1999), 8:708.

11 In his commentary on the Psalms Rivetus claims regarding the relationship between David and Christ that David, as a prophet of God, spoke in a typological manner; see Rivetus, *Commentarius in Psalmorum propheticorum*, 2–3.

12 While Christ suffered extremely in his senses, his emotions remained ordinate, because he did not despair. The underlying idea is that inordinate emotional passions would be sinful; cf. Don A. Monson, *Andreas Capellanus, Scholasticism, and the Courtly Tradition* (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2005), 181.

13 The insistence that Christ did not suffer a "punishment for eternity" must be explained against the background of the Socinian teaching, that it is unreasonable to argue that Christ purchased our salvation by paying the debt of our sins, because in that case he would have been submitted to eternal death; see RC, 305.

14 John of Damascus (c. 657–749) was one of the fathers of the Eastern Church. Aside from hymns that would have a long-lasting influence on the Orthodox liturgy, he also composed a number of theological writings, including *The Fount of Wisdom*. The third and final part

lib. 3. cap. 25.)[a] neque enim innuimus, Deum fuisse unquam Filio adversarium, vel iratum. Nam quomodo dilecto Filio, in quo anima ipsius acquievit, irasceretur? aut quomodo Patrem aliis sua intercessione placaret, quem infensum sibi haberet? ut scite Calvinus,[b] calumniam retundens, quam salutaris hujus doctrinae nomine patiebatur.

XI Ex dictis sequitur, injuriam Deo facere tamquam injusto, Christo tamquam imprudenti, qui asserere audent, minimam sanguinis Christi guttulam, minimam lacrymulam, minimum pectoris gemitum, sufficere potuisse* ad redemptionem generis humani, qui omnia, quae Christus ultra pertulit, hac praepostera dignitatis ejus praedicatione superflua reddunt, et mortem non necessariam,[c] quae tamen omnes illos dolores corporis et animae secuta est; in qua fuit vera, non δοξαστὸς, corporis et animae Christi a se invicem separatio, secundum unionem naturalem,* secundum effectus et secundum locum; manente nihilominus hypostatica* duarum naturarum* unione, corpus et animam sustentante: nam cum in symbolo confiteamur, Filium Dei fuisse mortuum et sepultum, quae de eo dici non possunt,* nisi secundum humanam naturam, quae autem sunt humanae naturae vel partium ejus, non dicuntur de Filio Dei nisi ratione unionis, consequens est, etiam in morte verbum* mansisse conjunctum partibus separatis.

XII Mortis vero tempore Christum fuisse hominem, quod asseruit sententiarum magister, lib. 3. dist. 22.[d] *secundum sermonis* proprietatem*, hac ducti ratione

[a] John of Damascus, *De fide orthodoxa* 3.25 (MPG 94:1093). [b] Jean Calvin, *Institutio* 2.16.11. Peter Barth and Wilhelm Niesel (ed.), *Joannis Calvini opera selecta* (Munich: C. Kaiser, 1926–1959) 3:496. [c] non necessariam innuunt: 1642. [d] Lombard, *Sententiae* 3.22.

of this work, which summarizes the teaching of the Greek fathers on the chief Christian mysteries, is the *De fide orthodoxa* referred to here and many other times in the *Synopsis*.

chapter 25). And we are not inclined to think that God was ever an enemy to the Son, or angry with him. For how could he have been angry with his beloved Son in whom his soul delighted? Or how could Christ have reconciled the Father to others through his intercession if he were hostile to him? (This was Calvin's clever retort to the slander he suffered for this teaching concerning redemption.)[15]

From these words it follows that people slander God for being unjust and 11
Christ for being unwise when they dare to make the claim that the smallest droplet of Christ's blood, the tiniest tear-drop, and the slightest groaning of the heart could* have been enough to redeem the human race.[16] By this backwards preaching about his worthiness, these people make every action superfluous that Christ performed over and above these, and they intimate that his death was not necessary, even though it did follow upon all of those sorrows of his heart and soul. It was in death that the real (and not just apparent) separation of the body from the soul of Christ occurred, a separation in the natural* union, in its effects, and in space. Nevertheless, the hypostatic* union of the two natures* (which maintains the body and the soul) remained. For since we confess in the Creed that "the Son of God died and was buried"—and these words cannot* be said about him except concerning his human nature (although what belongs to human nature or its parts is said about the Son of God only because of this union)—it follows that even in death the Word* remained joined to the parts that were separated.

We deny, however, that at the time of his death Christ was a man in the 12
restricted sense of the word,* as the 'Master of the Sentences' claimed ([Peter

15 The two rhetorical questions are quoted almost literally from *Institutes* 2.16.11, where Calvin rejects the suggestion that God was an angry opponent of his Son. Rivetus appears incorrect in suggesting that Calvin was answering his opponents here, because the phrases occur already in the first edition of the *Institutes*; see *OS* 1, 83 and John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion: 1536 Edition*, trans. Ford Lewis Battles (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 55. In this section Calvin defends his explanation of the descent into hell, from which Rivetus slightly distances himself in theses 30–32 below.

16 In his Jubilee Bull of January 27, 1343, Pope Clement VI stated that even one drop of blood from Christ would have been enough to redeem humankind, so that also the good works of the saints were supererogatory; see *DH* 1025–1027. Luther spoke similarly of one drop of Christ's blood; see *WA* 40-1:232. At the Synod of Dort, however, Johannes Maccovius had to admit that his phrase "We could have been saved by one droplet of Christ's blood or by a minimal passion" was inappropriate, and he promised to abstain from using this phrase in the future; see Willem J. van Asselt, "The Maccovius Affair," in *Revisiting the Synod of Dordt (1618–1619)*, ed. Aza Goudriaan and Fred van Lieburg (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 225.

negamus, quia Christus vere mortuus est, et ad mortem hominis pertinet, ut per mortem desinat esse homo, vel animal, separatione animae quae utriusque rationem complebat. Quocirca non jam[a] simpliciter hominem non dicimus, sed hominem mortuum per determinationem alienantem, suumque determinatum interimentem. Ne cum Apollinari sentiamus, λόγον corpori unitum fuisse ut formam materiae, quod veri hominis rationem destrueret.

XIII Mortem veram excepit vera sepultura Christi, secundum suum idem unius corpus; quod in sepulcro corruptum non fuit per *incinerationem* aut *resolutionem in sua elementa*, quam Damasc. *Orth. fid.* l. 3. cap. 28.[b] διάλυσιν καὶ ἀφανισμὸν vocat, etsi per separationem formae viventis desierit esse vivum corpus, Ps. 16, 10. et Act. 2, 27. et cap. 13, 35. Habet vero sepultura certae mortis rationem,* quae in monumento novo facta fuit, ne postea aliquis alius resurrexisse fingeretur; cui etiam, ita providente Deo, sigillum custodesque fuerunt appositi, quibus imprudenter hostes, et nihil tale[c] cogitantes, resurrectionis ejus veritatem obsignarunt, ingenti saxo ad speluncae os advoluto, quo simul calumniae os obturatum est.

XIV Huc pertinet, quod conscio et concedente Pilato fuit facta; ut de vera ejus morte ambigi non possit, cum ejus certitudo sancita fuerit publico judicis testimonio,* post inquisitionem a centurione factam. Ideo etiam viri non e vulgo ad eam rem, divina providentia dispensante, adhibiti fuerunt, qui non

[a] tum: 1642. [b] John of Damascus, *De fide orthodoxa* 3.28 (MPG 94:1100). [c] tamen: 1642.

Lombard,] *Sententiae*, book 3, distinction 22),[17] and we deny it because Christ truly did die, and it belongs to a man's death that upon dying he ceases to be a man (or a living being) because the soul that completed the existence of both [man and living being] has departed. For this reason a man who has died is not simply called a 'man' but 'a dead man,' with a qualification that brings in a new element while putting an end to what it defines. For we would not wish to concur with Apollinaris, who thought that the Word was united with the body like form and substance, which would ruin the essence of a real man.[18]

The true burial of Christ is premised upon his true death, as it was the self- 13
same body of the one person; in the grave this body was not destroyed by being burned or resolved into its component elements, which John of Damascus calls *dialusis* (dissolution) and *aphanismos* (extermination) (*An Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, book 3, chapter 28), although it did cease to be a living body by the removal of the living form (Psalm 16:10, Acts 2:27, 13:35). Real death surely is the reason* for burial, and that burial happened in a new grave, lest afterwards the story should be fabricated that someone else had arisen. Moreover, as God so provided it, a seal and guards were placed over it, whereby the enemy foolishly and without any consideration sealed the veracity of his resurrection by rolling a large stone before the mouth of the cave, thus also putting a seal over any slanderous tongue.

Of relevance here is the fact that the burial happened with the knowledge 14
and permission of Pilate, for after the centurion had made an enquiry into it, the judge guaranteed the certainty of Christ's death by means of his public statement*—so there can be no doubt about the fact that he had died. And it was for this reason also that, according to the dispensation of God's providence,

17 Peter Lombard (1095–1160) taught theology in the cathedral school of Notre Dame, Paris, where he produced his *Libri quatuor sententiarum*, one of the most influential scholastic textbooks and on which many later medieval theologians wrote commentaries. The *Four Books of Sentences* offer a framework for the medieval scholastic interpretation of Christian dogma and contain many quotations from Scripture and the church fathers.

18 Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea (c. 310–390), lent his name to "Apollinarism," a teaching that was officially declared a heresy in 381. In his defense of the Son's consubstantiality with the Father against the Arians, Apollinaris insisted that the perfect, divine Word united with an imperfect humanity so as to take the place of the *nous* (mind) in the latter. The result was a divine-human 'third thing' (*tertium quid*)—or, in the words of Rivetus, (divine) Word and (human) body united as form and substance—that was neither fully divine nor fully human and, in the eyes of his opponents, ruined Christ's real humanity. Rivetus's argument against Lombard's view of the dead Christ as 'a man in the restricted sense' thus comes close to Apollinaris's 'third thing.'

clam, sed palam, hoc officium sacrosancto corpori exhiberent, ut nihil fraudis in eo commissum fuisse cuilibet innotesceret.

XV Sepulturam secuta est detentio corporis Christi in sepulcro, usque ad tertium diem, quo tempore velut in potestate ac vinculis mortis versatus est Dei Filius, quasi devictus et exanimis jacens, cum tamen mortem vinceret, et ejus vincula disrumperet. Est autem illud detentionis triduum ita intelligendum, non quasi tribus integris diebus, et totidem integris noctibus, in sepulcro mansisset; sed duabus noctibus integris, scilicet diei sextae et septimae, et una die, nempe Sabbathi; ac proinde per synecdochen* intelligi debere,[a] quod de figura Jonae scribitur Matt. 12, 40. fuisse *Filium hominis tribus diebus et tribus noctibus in corde terrae, sicut Jonas in ventre ceti*; quia extremae parti diei naturalis,* constantis die et nocte, tribuitur nomen totius, atque ita νυχθήμερον integrum tantum in sepulcro moratus est Dominus, delibatis duorum reliquorum dierum partibus.

XVI Sic actum est de passione, morte et sepultura Christi; sequitur, ut eorundem causas* indagemus. Passionis Christi efficiens causa, vel remota* est, vel propinqua; et haec quidem, vel directe, vel indirecte efficiens. Remota est decretum Dei aeternum, sive ordinatio divina, hoc negotium ab aeterno sic disponens et regens, quia neque fortuito, neque ex fatali necessitate,* sed ex Dei Patris decreto per hunc modum,* sapientiae divinae convenientissimum, Christus, ut genus* humanum redimeret, passiones illas sustinuit, Act. 4, 28.

XVII Propinqua causa* efficiens directe, fuerunt omnes Christi hostes, Satan hostili odio insequens mulieris semen, et omnia Satanae instrumenta, Judas, Sacerdotes, Annas, Caiphas, Pilatus, et plebs promiscua, qui omnes graviter peccarunt, sed tamen inaequaliter secundum gradus, pro ratione cognitionis et malitiae, vel majoris vel minoris. Qua ratione* peccatum principum, qui ex invidia Christum tradiderunt crucifigendum, fuit omnium gravissimum; Judae

[a] debet: original disputation.

men were used in this affair who were not just from the common folk,[19] but would perform this task for the most holy body not in secret but openly, so that everyone might know that no fraud was committed therein.

The burial was followed by the confinement of Christ's body in the grave 15
until the third day, during which time the Son of God lay there as though held fast by the mighty chains of death, defeated and lifeless, even though he would conquer death and break its chains asunder. Moreover, this three-day confinement should be understood to mean that he had stayed in the grave not for three whole days and an equal number of whole nights, but for two whole nights (i.e., the nights of the sixth and seventh days of that week) and one whole day, namely the Sabbath-day. And therefore we should understand what Matthew 12:40 writes about the sign of Jonah in a figurative* sense: "The Son of Man was in death's embrace for three days and three nights, like Jonah in the belly of the sea-monster." For we call the final part of a natural* day a whole day (which consists of day-time and night-time), and in this way the Lord lingered in the grave only for one entire day-and-night, while parts are merely borrowed from the two other days.[20]

Having treated the passion, death, and burial of Christ, it follows that we 16
should now investigate their causes.* Of Christ's passion there are remote* and proximate efficient causes. And the proximate causes, in turn, are direct and indirect. The remote cause is God's eternal decree (or divine ordination), which was from eternity arranging and guiding this matter (because it was not by chance or a fatalistic necessity* but by the decree of God the Father, and through a means* that God's wisdom found to be very fitting) in a way for Christ to endure those passions to redeem the human race* (Acts 4:28).

The proximate direct efficient cause*[21] consisted of all Christ's enemies: 17
Satan, who pursued the seed of the woman with inimical hatred, and all the people who were instruments in Satan's hands—Judas, the priests, Annas, Caiaphas, Pilate, and the commoners. All these people committed grievous sins, although not equally, but in varying degrees, depending on the greater or lesser extent of their knowledge and evil intent. By this way of reckoning* the sin of the leaders who out of envy handed Christ over to be crucified was the

19 Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus.

20 The explanation of the difficulty by means of synecdoche may be traced to Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* 3.35.50 (CCSL 32:110–111).

21 Satan and sin are not labelled as instrumental causes related to the remote cause of the divine decree, but as different efficient causes. For a similar distinction between the *causa directe* of Christ's death, his persecutors, and the *causa indirecte*, Christ himself who offered himself; see Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 3.47.1.

peccatum fuit minus, si hoc spectetur quod ex avaritia magistrum vendiderit; sed aliis aggravatur circumstantiis, utpote antegressa Apostolatus dignitate, domestica cum Christo familiaritate, et similibus. Minus propter easdem rationes* peccarunt Judaei de plebe, et gentiles qui ex Pilati mandato Christum crucifixerunt.

XVIII Causa* efficiens propinqua sed indirecta, fuit Pater aeternus, qui *Filio proprio non pepercit, sed pro omnibus tradidit illum*, Rom. 8, 32. Fuit autem causa, 1. non impediendo passionem ejus, sed eum exponendo potestati persequentium, et deserendo eum, quomodo supra exposuimus. 2. praecipiendo ipsi Christo ut passionem illam pro hominibus sustineret, eique reatum nostrorum peccatorum imputando.[a] 3. inspirando illi mentem et voluntatem* patiendi.

XIX Ad efficientem etiam causam* indirecte, refertur voluntas* ipsius Christi, passionem acceptantis et patienter sustinentis, ex obedientia erga mandatum Patris, qua voluntarie mortem suscepit, quam alias, si absolute* consideretur, effugere potuisset,* quamvis non ex hypothesi praesupposito mandato Patris. *Nemo tollit animam meam a me*, Joh. 10, 18. Item, *ut cognoscat mundus quia diligo Patrem, et sicut mandatum dedit mihi Pater, sic facio; surgite, eamus hinc*. Joh. 14, 31. Qua ratione* passio Christi fuit sacrificium gratissimi odoris; quae illata ab hostibus fuit gravissimum peccatum.

XX Materia in qua, sive *subjectiva*, ut vocant, est Christus Filius Dei secundum humanam naturam,* qua sola potuit* pati, in anima et corpore, ut ostendimus, ita tamen ut vere dici[b] possit, totum Christum esse passum, non totum Christi, et per Idiomatum communicationem, *Dominum gloriae fuisse crucifixum*, 1 Cor. 2. 8. *et Deum sanguine suo ecclesiam acquisivisse*, Act. 20, 28. Materia quam objectivam dicunt, sunt poenae omnes Christo impositae, de quibus in passionis descriptione actum est.

XXI Forma externa consistit in ipsa passione et tolerantia gravissimarum poenarum; interna, in obedientia illa, quam exhibuit Patri usque ad mortem crucis,

[a] [Tess. 33. per totum]: original disputation. [b] vere dicere quis: 1642.

most serious of all. The sin of Judas was less serious, if one considers the fact that he sold his master out of greed; but it was made worse by accompanying factors such as his prior status as an apostle, his keeping company with Christ, and the like. For the same reason* the sin of the common Jews was less serious, as well as that of the gentiles who crucified Christ by the order of Pilate.

18 The proximate indirect efficient cause* was the eternal Father, who "did not spare his own Son, but gave him up for [us] all" (Romans 8:32). He was the cause: 1) by not hindering his suffering, but by exposing him to the forces of his persecutors and by forsaking him (as was set out by us above); 2) by ordering Christ himself to undergo that suffering on behalf of men, and by imputing to him the guilt of our sins; 3) by instilling in him the intention and willingness* to suffer.

19 What also belongs to the indirect efficient cause* is the will* of Christ himself, who accepted and patiently endured the suffering, in obedience to the Father's commands, whereby he willingly suffered death, which he could* have avoided otherwise (if regarded absolutely,* though not if regarded hypothetically from the Father's prior command). "No-one takes my life away from me" (John 10:18); similarly, "So that the world may know that I love the Father, and so I do what the Father has commanded me; let us rise and go hence" (John 14:31). It is for this reason* that Christ's passion was an offering of a very pleasant fragrance; insofar as it was his enemies who brought the offering, it was a very grievous sin.

20 The material of the passion (or 'what is its subject,' as some call it) is Christ the Son of God in his human nature;* and that is the only nature in which he could* suffer, in both body and in soul (as we have pointed out). And yet he suffered in a way that one can truly say that the 'whole Christ' (not 'the whole of Christ') suffered;[22] and through the communication of his proper qualities "the Lord of glory was crucified" (1 Corinthians 2:8), and "through his blood God obtained his Church" (Acts 20:28). And what they call the objective material are all the punishments that were placed on Christ's shoulders, which we treated when we described his suffering.

21 As to the outward form, it consists of Christ's actual suffering and endurance of very grievous punishments. The internal form consists of the obedience that he showed to his Father, to the point of his death on the cross, whereby he made

22 The distinction between *tota res* and *totum rei* is applied to Christology. That the whole Christ (*totus Christus*) but not all of Christ (*totum Christi*) suffered, explains that though Christ's divine nature as such did not suffer, still the suffering can be attributed to the person of the Christ, as the quoted texts from Scripture imply. For the background of the distinction see *SPT* 25.34.

qua sacrificium suum in ara crucis oblatum maxime commendavit, in quo idem sacerdos et victima unica, pro peccatis idonea, seipsum totum Patri obtulit et immolavit, Heb. 9, 14. Joh. 17, 19.

XXII Hinc de fine* mortis Christi dijudicare facile est; qui duplex constituitur: 1. Expiatio peccatorum nostrorum per satisfactionem infiniti* valoris et pretii. 2. Corporis peccati mortificatio et abolitio, quae in ejusdem sepultura significata est, cujus consortes facti fideles una cum Christo peccato mortui, sepeliuntur, ut in novam vitam resurgant, Rom. 6, 4. et Col. 2, 12.

XXIII Hujus autem finis,* omnibus ad quos Deus pro beneplacito voluntatis* suae mittit Evangelium annuntiati et propositi, soli in Christum credentes fiunt participes; adeoque etsi ad omnium redemptionem sufficientissimum sit passionis et mortis Christi pretium, tamen ex liberrimo Dei consilio et gratiosissima voluntate et intentione, vivifica et salvifica ejus efficacia, se in solis fidelibus exserit, ad eos fide justificante donandos, et per eam ad salutem certo perducendos; servator enim est *populi sui, corporis sui*, Mat. 1, 21. Eph. 5, 23. *pro ovibus animam posuit*, Joh. 10, 15. et *filiorum quos in gratiam adduxit, princeps salutis per afflictiones consecratus est*, Heb. 2, 10.

XXIV Ad humiliationem etiam pertinet, quod in symbolo fidei additur, Christum *ad inferos descendisse*, qui articulus, etsi lectus olim non fuerit, in Ecclesiae Romanae, aut Ecclesiae Orientalis symbolis, et a vetustissimis quibusdam Patribus, dum vel summam fidei Christianae colligunt, vel Apostolorum symbolum

the sacrifice offered on the altar of the cross very commendable. Herein he was at the same time both the priest and the unique victim suitable for sins, and so he offered and sacrificed his own whole being to the Father (Hebrews 9:14, John 17:19).

From this it is easy to determine the goal* or purpose of Christ's death. It 22
consists of two things: 1) the atonement for our sins through a satisfaction that is of infinite* worth and value; 2) the mortification and abolition of the body of sin, which his burial signified and in which believers are made partakers when they die to sin and are buried with Christ to rise up to a new life (Romans 6:4 and Colossians 2:12).

However, only those who believe in Christ become partakers of the goal* or 23
purpose that has been declared and presented to everyone to whom God sends his Gospel out of the good pleasure of his own will.* And even though the value of Christ's suffering and death was indeed all-sufficient for the redemption of all people, nevertheless by God's council (which is entirely free), and by his most gracious will and purpose, the life-giving and saving efficacy of Christ's suffering and death manifests itself only in those who believe, to bestow upon them justifying faith and by means of it to lead them on to their salvation with certainty.[23] For he is the Savior "of his people, his body" (Matthew 1:21, Ephesians 5:23). "He laid down his life for the sheep" (John 10:15), and "of the sons whom he brought to grace he was consecrated as the chief of their salvation through his sufferings" (Hebrews 2:10).

What also pertains to Christ's humiliation is what is added in the symbol of 24
the faith, that Christ descended into hell.[24] This article was not a reading in the past, for it was left out of the symbols of the Roman Church, the Eastern Church, and also by some of the earliest church fathers when they gave summaries of the Christian faith or explained the symbol of the Apostles' Creed.[25] And it

23 The distinction between the sufficiency of Christ's passion for the redemption of all people and its efficacy for the believers reflects the *Canons of Dort* 11:2, 8, though there the efficacy is related to election, here to faith.

24 The emphatic way in which Rivetus remarks that the descent into hell forms a part of Christ's state of humiliation must be explained against the background of the Lutheran view which considered the descent the first part of the state of exaltation. For the discussions concerning the descent into hell see Erich Vogelsang, "Weltbild und Kreuzestheologie in den Höllenfahrtsstreitigkeiten der Reformationszeit," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 38 (1941): 90–132.

25 In his commentary on Psalm 16, Rivetus mentions Irenaeus, Origen, Tertullian, Augustine and the Nicene Creed among those who omit it; see Rivetus, *Commentarius in Psalmorum*, 119. The phrase *descendit ad inferna* appeared for the first time in the Aquileian text of the creed in AD 309. There are variations in the preposition (*in* or *ad*) and the Athanasian

exponunt, fuerit omissus, nec quando insertum sit symbolo, certo constitui possit; non est tamen nihili si ad fidei analogiam* exigatur ejus interpretatio.

XXV Nomen* שאל *scheol*, cui respondet graecum ἅδης, et latinum *infernus*, duas habet significationes, unam propriam, alteram figuratam:* propria significatione in Scriptura accipitur, pro omni quod superficie terrae inferius jacet, una annotatione absumendi et excipiendi omnia quae viva antea fuerint; atque ita quia interitum spectat, quantum ex illius natura est, fit ut omnis hominum de hac vita mortali excedentium status, inferni nomine saepe in sacris literis indicetur. Metaphorica autem accipitur pro extremis doloribus et angustiis quales sentiunt damnati. Hinc alii descensum realem Christi ad inferos statuerunt, alii figurate* sic dictum.

XXVI Qui realem descensum ratione loci, pro varia, seu vera, seu imaginaria locorum ratione, varie etiam sentiunt. Nonnulli ad corpus referentes, nihil aliud intelligunt quam vel sepulturam, vel moram corporis Christi in sepulcro; alii ad animam referunt, idque varie. Nam quidam volunt animam Christi descendisse ad loca damnatorum, ut praesentia sua poenam eorum augeret, et ab eo descensu triumphum suum inchoaret. Alii ad locum quem in inferno fabricarunt, in quo volunt animas Patrum ante Christi mortem fuisse detentas, cui *limbi* nomen imposuerunt. Alii ad locum quidem damnatorum descendisse, et ad limbum Patrum, ut vocant, at non reali animae praesentia, sed tantum efficacia divinitatis suae.

Creed reads *inferos* ('underworld'). The phrase originally was a replacement of *sepultus* ('buried'); cf. Johan Buitendag, "John Calvin's understanding of Christ's descent into hell," in *Restoration Through Redemption: John Calvin Revisited*, Studies in Reformed Theology 23, ed. Henk van den Belt (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 135–158, 139.

cannot be determined for certain at what point in time it was inserted into the symbol. Even so, however, it has some value when the analogy* of faith is applied in interpreting it.

The word* *sheol* to which the Greek word *hades* and the Latin word *infernus* correspond, has a proper and a figurative* meaning. The proper meaning is used in Scripture for all that lies below the earth's surface, with the connotation that it consumes and absorbs everything that previously was living. And so because it concerns destruction, insofar as it respects the proper meaning, the sacred letters happen to give the name 'hell' to that entire state of all who have departed this mortal life. Metaphorically, however, the word is used for all the pains and distresses felt by those who have been condemned. Hence some think that Christ's descent was a real one, while others think it was a figurative* one that only was so called. 25

Those who hold that the descent was real in the sense of place have different views, too, depending on whether the place is real or imaginary. Some, who relate the descent to that of Christ's physical body, understand by it nothing other than the burial of Christ's body, or the time that it stayed in the grave;[26] others take it to mean his soul, in one way or another. For some think that Christ's soul descended to the place of the condemned for the purpose of increasing their punishment by being present there, and for commencing his triumph from that descended place.[27] Others relate the descent to some place in the underworld that they have made up, a place where they imagine the souls of the fathers were detained before the death of Christ, and they give it the name 'Limbo.'[28] Yet others again hold that Christ did descend to the place of the condemned, and to the Limbo of the fathers (as they call it), but not in the real presence of his soul, but only by the efficacious power of his divinity.[29] 26

26 Martin Bucer, among others, held this position; see Martin Bucer, *In sacra quatuor evangelia, enarrationes perpetuae* (Basel: Johannes Hervagius, 1536), 511; cf. John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. Ford Lewis Battles (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 513, note 18.

27 According to Luther the whole person of Christ, God and man, after the burial descended into hell to destroy the devil's power. This gained confessional status in the *Formula of Concord*, article 9.

28 This was the official teaching of the *Catechism of the Council of Trent* (1566), article 5. For *limbus patrum*; see *SPT* 28.18, 40.11, and for *limbus puerorum*; see *SPT* 39, corollary 1.

29 The Council of Trent rejected this view of Durand (see thesis 29 below) that the descent referred to the effects of the death of Christ upon the souls in the Limbo. "We are not to imagine that His power and virtue only, and not also His soul, descended into hell," *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, article 5.

XXVII Prima sententia in brevi symbolo admittit inutilem repetitionem, et interpretationem quae potius tenebras offunderet, quam praecedentem articulum illustraret. Secunda non minus absurda est, quia ad primum effectum inutilis erat; cum damnatis victoria Christi aliunde innotescere potuerit,* quam ex animae ejus praesentia, quae tum a corpore separata, testata potius fuisset, eum adhuc esse sub potestate mortis: qua ratione* absurditas secundi finis* refellitur, quia durante illa separatione, non potuit incipere triumphus.

XXVIII Tertia est merum humani cerebri inventum, quia locus ille nusquam in Scriptura comparet; nec ex ea usquam probari* potest, patres, qui in fide mortui sunt, inferorum subterraneorum carceribus detineri, qui in sinu Abrahae recipiebantur *in coelo*, ubi. Christo teste, erant Abraham, Isaac et Jacob, Matt. 8, 11. Quem locum Augustinus dicit esse, *requiem beatorum pauperum quorum est regnum coelorum, in quod post hanc vitam recipiuntur*, *Quaest. Evang*. lib. 2. cap. 38.[a] Nec diffitetur Maldonatus Jesuita, *posteriorum Theologorum obtinuisse opinionem, fuisse sub terra distinctum ab aliis poenarum locis*, in Luc. 16, 22.[b] qui certe a Marcione mutuati sunt, *quod utramque mercedem sive tormenti sive refrigerii, apud inferos determinent; eis positam qui legi et prophetis obedierint*, Tert. *Contra Marcion*. lib. 4. cap. 34.[c]

XXIX Utraque sententia refutatur dicto Christi, *Hodie mecum eris in paradiso*, Luc. 23, 43. Nisi enim paradisum in inferno collocent, quod dictu horrendum est, necessario lacerabitur eorum limbus, praesertim fatente Maldonato in Matt. 27, 44.[d] Christum *de paradiso locutum fuisse, ubi tunc non erat*; ne de Christo qua Deus est, vel de statu beatitudinis, dictum intelligant. Durandi[e] opinionem de *descensu efficaciae*, ipsi refellunt Pontificii, et, si de limbo intelligatur, quatenus

---

[a] Augustine, *Quaestionum evangeliorum* 2.38.1 (MPL 35:1350). [b] Juan de Maldonado, *Commentarii in quatuor evangelistas* (Mainz: F. Kirchheim, 1840–1844), 4:74. [c] Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* 4.34.11 (SC 456:422). [d] Juan de Maldonado, *Commentarii in quatuor evangelistas* 2:398. [e] Durandus de Sancto Porciano, *In sententias theologicas Petri Lombardi Commentariorum libri quatuor* (Lyon: Gulielmus Rovillius, 1587), 558–560.

Of these explanations the first one lets in a pointless repetition in this short 27
symbol, and it entails an interpretation that casts obscuring shadows rather than light on the preceding article [in the Creed]. The second explanation is no less absurd, because it offered no support for its primary purpose: Christ's victory could* have been made known to the damned by a way other than the presence of his soul, and as it was then separated from his body, his soul would have demonstrated instead that he was still in death's power. And for this reason* the second purpose* is refuted as absurd, because the triumph could not have started as long as the separation [of soul from body] lasted.

The third explanation is purely an invention of man's imagination, because 28
nowhere in Scripture can such a passage be found. And one cannot prove* from any place in Scripture that the fathers who had died in the faith are being kept in prisons of subterranean hells. For those who were in Abraham's bosom were received "in heaven," where Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were, as Christ testifies (Matthew 8:11). Augustine says that this place is "the rest of the blessed poor for whom the kingdom of heaven is, where they are taken up after this life" (*Evangelical Questions*, book 2, chapter 38). And the Jesuit Maldonado[30] does not deny that some of the "posterior theologians were of the opinion that under the earth there was a place set apart from the other places of punishments" (*Commentary* on Luke 16:22). No doubt these theologians borrowed it from Marcion, "because it is in the underworld that they locate the place of reward for those who kept the law and the prophets, a place that awards them torment or consolation" (Tertullian, *Against Marcion* 4.34).

Both of these [last two] views are refuted by what Christ says: "Today you 29
will be with me in Paradise" (Luke 23:43). For unless they locate Paradise in hell (which is a terrible thing to say), their Limbo must be broken up, especially as Maldonado admits [in his *Commentary*] on Matthew 27:44 that "Christ was speaking about a Paradise he was not in at that time,"[31] unless they understand the statement as coming not from Christ as God, and as not being about the state of blessedness. And as for Durand's opinion that [the symbol] concerns "the descent of [Christ's] efficacy," even the papal teachers themselves

30 Juan de Maldonado (1533–1583) came from Spain but taught in Paris from 1563–1576 and especially endeavored to convince Protestants to join the Roman Catholic Church. He later withdrew to Bourges to write his *Commentary on the Gospels*, which he was not able to finish before he died in Rome.

31 Maldonado rejects the idea that no special place was meant by 'Paradise,' because it is everywhere where Christ is, and the soul of the thief would follow Christ and see Him as God. Christ spoke of a place where he was not at that moment and if Paradise means only a place where God is seen, the thief was already in Paradise while hanging on the cross; see Juan de Maldonado, *A Commentary on the Holy Gospels* (London: J. Hodges, 1888), 2:540.

effectum statuit in re quae nusquam est, etiam cum priore illa ridicula est, nec de descensu efficaciae ad inferos, usquam est in Scriptura mentio, cum hic descensus ad humiliationem et abjectionem pertineat; et personae,* non efficaciae ullibi tribuatur.

XXX Supersunt aliae articuli expositiones, quae veritatem in re continent, et extra controversiam sunt apud omnes orthodoxos, si doctrinam in se* spectemus, non item si de articuli sensu proprio agatur: alii enim alium aptiorem existimant, quae lis non est magni momenti, cum in re omnes conveniant, et jam indicatum sit, hunc articulum in symbolo apud omnes Ecclesias olim non fuisse. Quidam igitur volunt, hoc articulo contineri omnium quae de externa illa Christi humiliatione dicta sunt, ἀνακεφαλαίωσιν: qua, quae prius articulatim posita erant, velut in angustum in exitu contrahuntur; ut significetur* totus humiliationis status, a primo usque ad infimum gradum. Quam eandem interpretationem amplectuntur, qui infernum pro morte, et descensum in infernum, pro descensu ad mortem accipiunt.

XXXI Alii per inferos statum mortis, et per articulum, descensum intelligunt, quo mortis statum subivit Christus, qui propterea notant, nunquam asserere Scripturam, Christum resurrexisse ex sepulcro, sed ἐκ νεκρῶν, ut significet,* eum qui antea fuerat inter mortuos, in statu mortuorum non semper mansisse, sed aliquando mortuum esse desiisse. Non longe ab eorum sensu distant, qui ad commorationem illam triduanam articulum referunt, quam a sepelitione diversam esse statuunt, et separatum beneficium contulisse, itaque separatum in symbolo articulum commeruisse, in qua Christus corporum nostrorum ignominiam degustavit, quam *seminationem* vocat Paulus, 1 Cor. 15, 43. Nisi hoc

refute it;[32] and if the statement is about Limbo, since Durand is positing an effect of something that doesn't exist anywhere, then it is as ridiculous as the aforementioned view.[33] Moreover, Scripture nowhere mentions that Christ's 'efficacy' descended into hell; for this descent pertains to the humiliation and rejection of the Christ. Throughout [Scripture] the descent is ascribed to a person,* not to an efficacy.

There remain some differing explanations of the article that are true in 30
substance and beyond controversy among all orthodox teachers[34] regarding the doctrine as such*—though not when it concerns the article taken in its proper sense. For some think that one sense is more fitting, and others another sense—a difference of opinion that is of little import since they all substantially agree. And, as has been noted already, this article did not occur in the symbol of all the churches in early days.[35] Therefore some are of the opinion that this article contains a recapitulation of everything that was said about that outward humiliation of Christ. Like a brief conclusion, it draws together what had been stated earlier article by article; thus it stands* for the whole state of humiliation, from the first step down to the last one. That same interpretation is embraced by those who take 'hell' to mean death, and 'the descent into hell' to mean his going down to death.

Others take 'hell' to mean the state of death, and take the article to refer to 31
that descent whereby Christ experienced the state of death. For this reason they point out that Scripture nowhere makes the claim that Christ arose from the grave but 'from the dead'—which indicates* that he who previously had been among the dead did not remain forever in the state of the dead but at a certain point stopped being dead. Not far away from their understanding are those who relate the article to Christ's tarrying for three days, which they consider to be different from his burial and to bring with it a separate benefit. Therefore, they think, it deserved a separate article in the symbol, having the sense that Christ tasted the dishonor that comes to our bodies, which Paul calls "the sowing" (1Corinthians 15:43). [This interpretation does not hold] unless we make the

32 This is the fourth view mentioned at the end of thesis 26 above.

33 Durand of St. Pourçain (1270/5–1334) was a Dominican friar, a key figure in the early development of Thomism in the Dominican order.

34 Reformed theologians had different concepts of the *descensus ad inferos*. The most common view was that it referred to the sufferings of Christ's soul, but others restricted it to Christ's burial or to the dominion of death. On the diverse opinions see Herman Bavinck, John Bolt (ed.), *Reformed Dogmatics* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003–2008), 3:15 and Mark Jones, "John Calvin's Reception at the Westminster Assembly (1643–1649)," *Church History and Religious Culture* 91 (2011): 215–227, especially 223–226.

35 See thesis 24 above.

discrimen statuatur, quod mortuorum status ad corpus et animam, quatenus a corpore separata est, referatur; commoratio autem in sepulcro, ad corpus tantum.

XXXII Hi posteriores sensus, si articulorum consequentia consideretur, et rerum gestarum ordo, prout in Evangelica historia narratur, maximam habent probabilitatem, praesertim cum inter primas, et proprias hujus phraseos significationes, habeatur illa de *mortis statu*, ut initio dictum est. Nec tamen quae vulgo recepta est in publicis Catechesibus interpretatio, minus vera est aut apta; qua per descensum ad inferos, intelliguntur inferni dolores, et irae Dei gravitas ac velut desertio quam Christus in anima expertus est, ut supra exposuimus. Nec inconveniens est, hos duos descensus, quod nonnulli faciunt, conjungere: cum uterque ad extremam Christi humiliationem pertineat, et in phrasi fundamentum* habeat: utriusque etiam doctrina vera sit et necessaria, ut ex dictis abunde liquet.

XXXIII Sic de humiliatione Christi pro instituti ratione satis. Ex qua hi nobis fructus sunt colligendi, plenissimam nos habere in Christo pro omnibus peccatis nostris satisfactionem et expiationem; morti victoriam extortam esse et abolitum ᾅδου κέντρον; per ignominiam Christi, ad summam gloriam nos esse evehendos, et inferni sedem nobis debitam, mutatam esse in coeleste domicilium, quod suis praeparavit et disposuit Christus Dominus.

XXXIV Praeter haec immensa beneficia illud etiam maximum sumus consecuti, ut in hac una passione, omnium virtutum clarissima exempla habeamus, patientiae, humilitatis, caritatis, mansuetudinis, obedientiae, etc, ut vere dicere possimus, Salvatorem nostrum, quaecunque vitae praecepta toto suae praedicationis tempore verbis nos docuit, ea omnia uno passionis die in se expressisse. Cui in aeternum gloria!

Tertull. lib. *De Carne Christi*, cap. 5.[a]

Natus est Dei Filius; non pudet, quia pudendum est. Et mortuus est Dei Filius.; prorsus credibile est, quia ineptum est. Et sepultus resurrexit; certum est, quia impossibile est. Sed quae quomodo in illo vera erunt, si ipse non fuit verus, si

[a] Tertullian, *De carne Christi* 5.4–5 (CCSL 2:881).

distinction that the state of the dead refers to the body and the soul only to the extent that the soul is separated from the body, and moreover that Christ's tarrying in the grave refers only to his body.

These latter meanings are the most likely ones if we follow the logical 32
progression of the articles and the order of the events that occurred, as told in the gospel-history; especially because the meaning, 'the state of death,' is among the primary and proper ones in this phrase, as was stated at the outset. And yet the interpretation that is commonly found in the public Catechisms is equally true and no less fitting: the descent into hell means hellish agonies, the weight of God's anger like the forsakenness that Christ experienced in his soul, as we have explained above.[36] Joining these two descents [the spiritual and the physical one] would make for a good fit, as indeed some explainers do. For both pertain to Christ's final humiliation and they are grounded* in the phrase; what is more, both of them are true and necessary doctrines, as is abundantly clear from what we have stated.

This will suffice for our undertaking to treat the humiliation of Christ. And 33
we should reap the following benefits from it: that in Christ we possess the fullest satisfaction and expiation for all our sins; that the victory has been snatched away from death and the sting of death has been removed; that through Christ's shame we are to be raised up to the highest glory; that the dwelling-place of hell which we deserved has been exchanged for a home in heaven, which Christ the Lord has prepared and made ready for those who are his.

Besides these countless benefits, we have obtained also that greatest one 34
of all, namely that in this one act of suffering we possess the most illustrious examples of all virtues: patience, humility, love, gentleness, obedience, etc., so that we can truly state that on that one great day of suffering our Savior manifested in himself all the precepts of life that he had taught us in words throughout the time of his ministry. To him be the glory forever.

Tertullian *On the Body of Christ*, chapter 5

The Son of God was born: this is no shame because it is shameful. The Son of God died: this is entirely worthy of faith because it is foolish. And after he was buried he arose: this is certain because it is impossible. But how shall these things be true in him if he himself was not real, if he did not really have in

36 The reference probably is to *Heidelberg Catechism*, Question and Answer 44. The plural might refer to other Reformed catechisms, such as Calvin's *Genevan Catechism* that explains the descent by pointing to Christ's death and his suffering of the pains of death (Acts 2:24), the agonies by which Christ's soul was pierced (Question and Answer 65).

non vere habuit in se quod crucifigeretur, quod moreretur, quod sepeliretur, et resuscitaretur? Carnem scilicet hanc sanguine suffusam, ossibus substructam, nervis[a] *intextam, venis implexam, qua nasci et mori novit, humanam sine dubio, ut natam de homine.*

Ambros. *De incar. Dominic. sacr.* cap. 6.[b]

Secundum naturam se obtulit nostram, ut ultra nostram operaretur naturam. De nostro sacrificium, de suo praemium est.

[a] venis: original disputation.

[b] Ambrose, *De incarnationis dominicae sacramento* 6.54 (CSEL 79:251–252).

himself that which was crucified, which died, was buried and rose again, that is to say: this human flesh suffused with blood, supported by bones, interwoven with sinews, entwined with veins, whereby he knew what it was to be born and to die—without a doubt was human flesh born of man.

Ambrose, *On the Incarnation of the Lord*, chapter 6

He offered himself according to our nature, so that he might perform his work beyond our nature. The sacrifice belongs to us, the reward to him.

DISPUTATIO XXVIII

De Statu Exaltationis Jesu Christi

Praeside D. ANTONIO WALAEO
Respondente DANIELE SUAVIO

THESIS I QUUM totum munus Christi Servatoris nostri, statu humiliationis atque exaltationis in Scriptura definiatur, ac de primo antecedente disputatione sit actum; reliquum jam est, ut de altero quoque statu, nempe exaltationis ejus, deinceps agamus.

II Quemadmodum vero in statu Christi priore, tres diversi gradus antecedenti disputatione distincte sunt observati, nempe mors crucis, sepultura ejus, atque ad inferos descensus; ita in hoc posteriore, tres gradus oppositi distincte quoque nobis erunt explicandi, nempe resurrectio a mortuis, ascensus in coelos, et sessio ejus ad dextram Patris.

III Resurrectionem ejus a mortuis, adversus Marcionitas, Libertinos, et similis farinae homines, qui Christo umbraticum corpus, et actiones umbraticas tribuere sunt ausi, definimus, veram et actualem Christi in vitam resuscitationem, qua corpus ejus ab anima vere sejunctum, et tridui mora in sepulcro sine ulla corruptione naturali* detentum, cum anima ejusdem, quae toto mortis tempore in Paradiso erat versata, rursum vere et naturaliter conjunctum fuit, atque in vitam hanc proprie* dictam reductum, mortalitate tamen ac reliquis vitae hujus infirmitatibus plane depositis.

DISPUTATION 28

On Jesus Christ in his State of Exaltation

President: Antonius Walaeus
Respondent: Daniel Swavius[1]

Since Scripture defines the whole office of Christ our Savior by his states of humiliation and exaltation, and since the previous disputation treated the first of these, it now remains for us to offer a successive treatment of the second state, namely his exaltation. 1

In fact, just as the preceding disputation distinctly observed three different steps in Christ's first state (namely his death on the cross, his burial, and his descent into hell), so too in his second state we should set forth the three distinct steps that counter-balance them: Christ's resurrection from the dead, his ascension into heaven, and his sitting down at the Father's right hand.[2] 2

Contrary to the Marcionites, Libertines, and men of similar ilk who dared to attribute to Christ a phantom body and phantom actions,[3] we define Christ's resurrection from the dead as his true and actual resuscitation to life, whereby his body, which really had been separated from his soul and had been kept for a three-day period in the grave with no natural* decay, was truly and naturally reunited with his soul which had spent the entire time of his death in Paradise,[4] and was brought back to this same life (in the proper sense* of the word), although it had obviously put aside mortality and the other weaknesses of this life. 3

---

1 Born 1599 in Middelburg, Daniel de Swaef matriculated on February 23, 1619 in theology. He defended this disputation in April 1622. He was ordained in Aagtekerke in 1624 and Middelburg 1638. He died in 1654. See Du Rieu, *Album studiosorum*, 139, Van Lieburg, *Repertorium*, 243, and *NNBW* 2:1398–1399.

2 See *SPT* 27.4.

3 On the view of Marcion regarding the body of Christ see *SPT* 25 antithesis 3.i, note 39; cf. *SPT* 51.9. Marcion or the Marcionites are also mentioned in *SPT* 8.4 and 27.28. The nickname Libertines is used pejoratively and stands for radical and spiritualistic groups; the precise historical reference is unclear (cf. *SPT* 2.8). See also Mirjam G.K. van Veen and Jesse Sponholz, "Calvinists vs. Libertines: A New Look at Religious Exile and the Origins of 'Dutch' Tolerance," in Gijsbert van den Brink and Harro M. Höpfl (eds.), *Calvinism and the Making of the European Mind*, Studies in Reformed Theology 27 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2014), 76–99; and Benjamin Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines: Confession and Community in Utrecht* 1578–1620 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995).

4 See *SPT* 27.29.

IV Infirmitates illae, quas Christus resurgendo deposuit, sunt duorum generum: tum quibus ex prima creatione in vitam hanc animalem, humana natura* fuit subjecta; de quibus Apostolus 1 Cor. 15, 44. et alibi Scriptura agit; tum quibus peculiariter tamquam sponsor noster propter peccata nostra seipsum subjecit, *similiter nobiscum per omnia tentatus excepto peccato*, Hebr. 4, 15.

V Negamus tamen, propterea Christum vel essentiam,* vel essentiales* proprietates naturae* humanae per resurrectionem suam deposuisse, non magis quam nos eas post hanc vitam deponemus; quum corpora nostra illius corpori glorioso sint futura conformia, Phil. 3, 21., quandoquidem ipse Christus etiam post resurrectionem discipulis suis testatus sit, corpus suum carne et ossibus constare, adeoque visui atque tactui esse expositum, Luc. 24, 39.

VI Unde videmus, quam graviter illi errent, qui Christum post resurrectionem, ejusmodi corpus resumpsisse statuunt, quod omni quantitate ac dimensione careat, et instar spiritus quaevis alia corpora, sine eorum cessione aut apertione penetret; et quanto adhuc gravius errent illi, qui id in multis simul locis eodem temporis momento (quod ne quidem spiritibus concessum est) per reproductionem (ut hodierni Jesuitae loquuntur) adesse fingunt. *Tolle enim spatia sua corporibus, nusquam erunt, et quia nusquam erunt, nec erunt; tolle ipsa corpora qualitatibus* corporum, non erit ubi sint, et ideo necesse est ut non sint*, ut Augustinus convenienter naturae ac Scripturae loquitur, Epist. 57. ad Dardanum.[a]

VII Causa* efficiens principalis est, tum Deus Pater per Spiritum suum, Rom. 8, 11. qui ad demonstrationem veritatis ac justitiae suae Christum ex morte, a qua

[a] The quotation is from Augustine's letter to Dardanus (chapter 6.18), which is currently numbered as epistle 187, and is also called "Book on Divine Presence" (CSEL 57:96).

Those infirmities which Christ laid aside with his resurrection are of two 4
kinds: to some of them the human nature* is subject by virtue of the first creation into this life as a living being (and the Apostle deals with them in 1 Corinthians 15:44, and elsewhere in Scripture). Other infirmities are the particular ones to which Christ on account of our sins subjected himself as our surety, "having been tempted like us in everything, sin excepted" (Hebrews 4:15).

However, we state that Christ did not therefore lay aside the essence* (or the 5
essential* properties) of human nature* by his resurrection—no more than we shall lay them aside after this life. For our bodies will be conformed unto his glorious body (Philippians 3:21), just as after his resurrection Christ himself bore witness to his disciples that his body consisted of flesh and bones, and accordingly it was exposed to sight and touch (Luke 24:39).

Hence we see how badly they err who hold that Christ after his resurrection 6
received a body of the sort that lacked any size or measurable shape, but like a ghost entered into any other bodies whatsoever without them giving way or opening up [for him].[5] And we see how even more badly they err who imagine that his body is present in many places at once in the same moment of time (something that is granted not even to ghosts) through 'reproduction' (as contemporary Jesuits call it).[6] For "take away their space from bodies and there will be no place where they exist, and because they'll not exist anywhere, they will not exist at all. Take away the bodies from the qualities* of the bodies and there will not be anything where [the qualities] are—and so it must be that they do not exist," as Augustine says, in accordance with nature* and with Scripture (Epistle 57, to Dardanus).[7]

The principal efficient cause* [of Christ's resurrection] is God the Father 7
through his Spirit (Romans 8:11), who for a display of his truth and righteousness

5 This probably refers to the so-called 'Ubiquitarian view' in Lutheranism; Walaeus mentions the Ubiquitarians explicitly in theses 9, 14, 15, and 30, below.

6 After the Council of Trent, most Roman Catholic theologians held, contrary to Aquinas, that with the consecration of the host, the substance of the bread was annihilated. Some, like the Jesuits Francisco Suárez (1548–1617) and Leonard Lessius (1554–1623) favored the 'reproduction' theory: Christ's body becomes present in the host by a kind of creative act and without compromising its numerical identity with Christ's body in heaven. Others such as Bellarmine, opt for the 'adduction' theory: Christ's pre-existing body is adduced in the host, without leaving heaven or without local motion. See Cyril Vollert, "Transubstantiation," in *New Catholic Encyclopedia*. 2nd ed. (Detroit: Gale, 2003), 14:158–160.

7 Augustine argues that bodies cannot exist without the space that they occupy and the place they are located in. Likewise, bodily properties (e.g., health) cannot exist apart from bodies and apart from the place of the latter. Walaeus uses this argument to refute the idea that—in the Lord's Supper—Christ's heavenly body can be separated from its place in heaven.

fieri non potuit* ut detineretur, Act. 2, 24. resuscitavit. Tum ipse quoque Filius, qui, ut se potenter Dei Filium secundum Spiritum sanctificationis declararet, Rom. 1, 4. et ut ex propria voluntate,* secundum mandatum Patris se animam suam pro nobis posuisse ostenderet, se ipsum jam Satanae ac peccati per mortem victorem, Heb. 2, 14. propria ac divina sua virtute, in vitam revocavit, sicuti ipse testatur, Joh. 2, 19. et 10, 18.

VIII Fines* resurrectionis Christi, qui et ejus effectus ac fructus dici possunt, sunt multi ac varii: 1. ut plenissime pro peccatis nostris esse satisfactum, et justitiam aeternam esse reductam, hac sua de morte victoria testaretur, Rom. 4, 25. 1 Cor. 15, 17. et 57. 2. ut sicuti virtute mortis ejus, vetus noster homo est mortificatus, ita et virtute resurrectionis ejus, novus homo in nobis revivisceret, et imago Dei restauraretur, Rom. 6, 4. 3. ut ipsius resurrectio nostrae futurae resurrectionis esset certissimum pignus et causa, 1 Cor. 15, 22. ac denique, ut per resurrectionem suam sibi aditum patefaceret, ad[a] reliqua munera sua pro nobis obeunda, per quae tamquam Propheta, Intercessor et Rex noster, vim mortis et sacrificii sui nobis in aeternum applicaret, Rom. 14, 9.

IX Quemadmodum vero Christus proprio suo corpore resurrexit, etiam vulnerum, quae in cruce acceperat ad veritatem ejus testandam, vestigiis insignitum: ita et nostra corpora eadem numero ante ultimum judicium resuscitatum iri, adversus Marcionitas, Anabaptistas quosdam, et similes haereticos, hinc evidenter consequitur. *Christus enim suscitatus est ex mortuis, et primitiae eorum qui obdormierunt, est factus*, 1 Cor. 15, 20.

X Resurrectionem Christi sequitur ejus in coelos ascensus. Nam postquam Servator noster dies 40. continuos cum discipulis conversatus, ea quae ad regnum ipsius spirituale erigendum spectabant, illis plenius explicasset, Act. 1, 3. et

[a] ac: 1642.

made Christ to be alive from the dead, which was not able* to keep its hold on him (Acts 2:24). The Son himself is also the principal efficient cause,[8] so that he powerfully declares himself to be the Son of God according to the Spirit of sanctification (Romans 1:4), and so that he might show that he had laid down his life for us by his own will* (in keeping with the Father's command), he now as victor over Satan and sin through death (Hebrews 2:14) called himself back to life by his own, divine power, as he himself testifies (John 2:19 and 10:18).

In Christ's resurrection there are several diverse goals,* which may also be called its effects or fruits: 1) to testify by this victory over his death that the fullest satisfaction has been made for our sins and that eternal righteousness has been restored (Romans 4:25; 1 Corinthians 15:17 and 57); 2) so that just as by the power of his death our old man was put to death, so too by the power of his resurrection is the new man brought to life in us, thus restoring God's image (Romans 6:4); 3) so that his resurrection might be a very sure pledge and cause for our future resurrection (1 Corinthians 15:22);[9] and finally 4) that through his resurrection he might open the way for himself to the other offices that he was going to execute for us, whereby as our Prophet, Intermediary, and King he might apply the power of his death and sacrifice to us for eternity (Romans 14:9). 8

From this it obviously follows that Christ arose in his own body, the body still marked with traces of the wounds he had received on the cross as proof that it was his real body. In the same way our very same bodies, too, will be restored to life before the final judgment, just as they are, contrary to what the Marcionites, some Anabaptists,[10] and like-minded heretics think. "For Christ has indeed been raised up from the dead, and has become the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep" (1 Corinthians 15:20). 9

Christ's resurrection is followed by his ascension into heaven. For after his resurrection our Savior spent forty days continuously with his disciples. He explained to them more fully the things that pertain to setting up his spiritual 10

8 The Socinians denied this because they denied Christ's divinity; see *RC*, 361.

9 These first three benefits are also mentioned in the *Heidelberg Catechism*, Question and Answer 45.

10 According to Ursinus, the Anabaptists deny that the same bodies which we now have will rise again and hold that God will create new bodies at the second coming of Christ. See Zacharias Ursinus, *The Commentary of Dr. Zacharias Ursinus on the Heidelberg Catechism*, trans. George W. Williard, 4th American edition (Cincinnati: Elm Street Printing Company, 1888), 313. Cf. Henk van den Belt, "Anabaptist Spirituality and the Heidelberg Catechism," in *The Spirituality of the Heidelberg Catechism: Papers of the International Conference on the Heidelberg Catechism Held in Apeldoorn 2013*, ed. Arnold Huijgen (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 50–61.

nova auctoritate ad illud per totum mundum inter omnes gentes propagandum eos instruxisset, Marc. 16, 15. tandem humanam suam naturam,* relicto hoc mundo, spectantibus discipulis, et testibus Angelis, in coeleste sacrarium subvexit, Act. 1, 9.

XI In hac ascensione Christi, tria praecipue ad veram hujus articuli notitiam sunt consideranda: I. locus in quem ascendit, II. forma seu modus* quo ascendit, ac denique fines* seu fructus hujus ascensionis.

XII Locus in quem Christus ascendit, omnium Evangelistarum consensu est coelum. Quo non aërem aut coelos hos visibiles intelligimus, quos pertransiisse dicitur, Hebr. 4, 14. nec solum statum gloriosum ac coelestem, ut Ubiquitarii contra totius antiquitatis consensum commenti sunt, sed ipsum coeleste ac gloriosum beatorum spirituum habitaculum, quod supra omnes visibiles coelos a Scriptura constituitur. In quod Henoch et Elias, virtute ascensus Christi venturi, antea praecesserant, Hebr. 11, 5. et 2 Reg. 2, 1. et in quod corpora nostra postquam animabus suis unita rursum fuerint, virtute ejusdem Christi ascensus recipientur, Joh. 14, 2. Phil. 3, 21.

XIII Demonstrant* illud, praeter historiae Evangelicae literalem ac genuinum sensum, nomina quibus hoc coelum, in quod Christus ascendit, in Scripturis denotatur. Joh. 6, 58. vocatur *coelum ex quo Christus descendit*, et v. 62. *ubi Christus prius* (nempe quam veniret in hunc mundum) *erat*. Joh. 14. 2. vocatur *domus Patris, in quam Christus profectus est nobis locum paraturus*. Eph. 4. 10. dicitur ascendisse ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν, *supra omnes coelos*. Phil. 3. vs. ult. dicitur *coelum in quo est nostra civitas*. Heb. 11, 16. *patria supercoelestis*, et

kingdom (Acts 1:3), and instructed them with renewed authority to extend it among all peoples throughout the whole world (Mark 16:15). And then, when leaving this world behind at last, as his disciples were looking on and angels were bearing witness, he conveyed his human nature* into the heavenly sanctuary (Acts 1:9).

In this ascension of Christ three things should receive special consideration for a good understanding of this article: 1) the place to which he ascended; 2) the form or manner* in which he ascended; and 3) the goals* or fruits of this ascension.[11] 11

By the consensus of all the Gospel-writers, the place to which Christ ascended is heaven. By this we do not mean the air or these visible skies, for Hebrews 4:14 states that he traveled through them. Nor do we mean only a glorious and celestial state, which the Ubiquitarians have dreamt up, contrary to the unanimous consent of all antiquity.[12] But he went to the actual heavenly and glorious dwelling-place of the blessed spirits, which Scripture locates above and beyond all the visible heavens. It is to this place that Enoch and Elijah went on ahead by the power of the ascension of the coming Christ (Hebrews 11:5; 2 Kings 2:1), and the place where our own bodies will be received after they will be united again with their souls by the power of that same ascension of Christ (John 14:2; Philippians 3:21). 12

Besides the literal, genuine meaning of the gospel-history, the names whereby the Scriptures designate this heaven into which Christ ascended demonstrate* this.[13] John 6:58 calls it "the heaven from which Christ came down," and "the place where Christ was before" (i.e., before he came into this world, John 6:62). John 14:2 calls it "the Father's house, where Christ went in order to prepare a place for us." Ephesians 4:10 says that "he ascended higher than all the heavens." The ending of Philippians 3[:20] calls it "heaven, where 13

11 Walaeus appears to structure his reply to the issues he is addressing in this section, at least in part, along the lines of the Heidelberg Catechism, as will become evident in theses 12, 20–23, 26, 28, 31–32.

12 For the 'Ubiquitarians' see *SPT* 25 antithesis 4.iii, note 47. References to the 'Ubiquitarians' also appear in theses 14, 15, and 30 below; cf. thesis 6 above. They claimed that the omnipresence of Christ belongs not to the human nature *per se*, but to Christ's human nature in union with the person of the divine Logos. Cf. *DLGTT*, s.v. "ubiquitas." On ubiquitarianism in this time period see Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1640*, Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 385.

13 Namely what is stated in thesis 12 that heaven is the dwelling-place of the blessed spirits beyond all the visible heavens.

12, 22. *Jeruzalem* ἐπουράνιος. 2 Cor. 12, 4. *Paradisus*, et vers. 2. *coelum tertium*, in quod Paulus raptus Christum vidit et audivit. Quae omnia et similia de nullo alio coelo, quam beatorum aeterna sede et habitaculo, intelligi in Scripturis solent.

XIV Modus* hujus ascensus fuit verus et corporeus, sicut tota Evangelica historia testatur, non aliqua tantum disparitio ex oculis discipulorum in aëre, ut Ubiquitarii fingunt. Nam sic Christus in coelum ascendisset, priusquam vere ascendit; quandoquidem ex discipulorum conspectu, etiam antequam vere in coelum ascendit, nonnunquam miraculose subductus fuit, ut videre est Luc. 24, 31. Nec est ipsa corporis Christi glorificatio, quia Christus etiam ante passionem suam ad tempus fuit transfiguratus, Matt. 17, 2., unde sequeretur, eum ad tempus in coelum ascendisse et rursum descendisse, antequam vere ascendit: quae omnia sunt absurda et a Scripturae loquendi usu plane aliena.

XV Modi loquendi, quibus Scriptura de hoc Christi in coelos ascensu passim utitur, evincunt quoque ascensum hunc fuisse verum et realem, ut Marc. 16, 19. ἀνελήφθη εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, *sursum receptus est in coelum*. Luc. 24, 51. ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, *sursum ferebatur in coelum*. Act. 1, 9. ἐπήρθη, *in altum sublatus est*, et vers. 11. *Ille ipse Jesus, qui sursum receptus est a vobis in coelum, ita veniet, quomodo vidistis eum proficiscentem in coelos*. Sic Apost. Heb. 9, 12. dicit, pontificem nostrum *semel ingressum esse in sancta*. At secundum eos saepius ingressus esset, quotiescunque nempe, ex ipsorum sententia apparuit in terra et rursum disparuit; et vers. 24. *Non enim in manu facta sacraria introivit Christus, quae sunt verorum* ἀντίτυπα, sed in ipsum coelum, ut nunc *compareat coram facie Patris pro nobis*. Imo vero Joh. 16, 28. Christus testatur, se non tantum *ad Patrem abire, sed et hunc mundum relinquere*, quod non nisi de reali loci mutatione intelligi potest.

XVI Nec vero propterea sequitur, ut quidam inter eos inepte colligit, si haec ascensio sit vera loci mutatio, Christum immani temporis spatio opus habuisse ad hoc iter versus coelum conficiendum. Nam si vel altissimae stellae, et coeli supremi mobilis quaelibet partes, intra quatuor horas tantum spatium,

our citizenship is." Hebrews 11:16 calls it "a supercelestial fatherland," and 12:22, "the heavenly Jerusalem." 2 Corinthians 12:4 calls it "Paradise," and verse 2 "the third heaven," whereto Paul was caught up and where he beheld and heard Christ. All these and similar passages in the Scriptures are usually understood to concern no other heaven than that eternal seat and dwelling-place of the blessed.

The manner* of Christ's ascension was real, bodily, as the whole gospel- 14
history testifies; it was not only some 'disappearance' into thin air before the eyes of the disciples, as the Ubiquitarians imagine. For that is how Christ would have ascended before he actually did ascend, since he was miraculously removed from the disciples' sight on several occasions even before he truly ascended into heaven, as can be seen from Luke 24:31. Nor is it the glorification of Christ's body itself, because even before his suffering Christ was transfigured for a time (Matthew 17:2). If so, it would follow from this that he had ascended into heaven for a period of time and then came down again, before his actual ascension. All of this is nonsense and obviously foreign to the manner in which Scripture speaks.

Also the kinds of expressions that Scripture everywhere employs for this 15
ascension of Christ into heaven prove that this ascension was true and real. Mark 16:19 has "he was taken up into heaven;" Luke 24:51: "He was carried up into heaven;" Acts 1:9: "He was taken up on high," and verse 11: "This same Jesus who was taken up from you into heaven, will come back in the same way you have seen him go into heaven." And so also the apostle says in Hebrews 9:12 that our high priest "entered into the most holy place once and for all." But according to [the Ubiquitarians] he would have entered heaven more often, in fact whenever he (in their opinion) appeared on the earth and then disappeared again. And verse 24 states: "For Christ did not enter a sanctuary that was made with hands, which was only a copy of the true one, but he entered into heaven itself now to appear before his Father's face on our behalf." Indeed, in John 16:28 Christ testifies that he is not only "going to the Father, but that he is also leaving this world"—which can only be taken to mean a real change of place.

However, it does not therefore follow that if this ascension were a real change 16
of place Christ required a vast amount of time to complete this journey to heaven (as one of them has foolishly concluded).[14] For if even the highest of stars, and whatever parts of the highest moving heaven, in their natural*

14 The reference is probably to Johannes Brenz (1499–1570), the Lutheran reformer of Württemberg; see Joar Haga, *Was there a Lutheran Metaphysics? The Interpretation of* communicatio idiomatum *in Early Modern Lutheranism* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 142.

quantum inter supremum coelum et terram intercedit, naturali* suo motu conficiunt, quemadmodum ex proportione radii ac circumferentiae in circulo est notum; quanto minori tractu temporis, corpus Christi jam immortale et glorificatum, habuit opus, ut e terra in coelum divina virtute eveheretur, quemadmodum spectantibus Apostolis factum esse testatur Scriptura, Act. 1, 10.

XVII An Christus solus in coelum ascenderit, an vero cum aliquo comitatu et triumpho, a nonnullis disputatur. Etsi enim Act. 1. nulla illius comitatus fiat mentio, sunt tamen magni nominis Theologi, qui ex quorundam aliorum locorum comparatione id colligunt. Existimant enim, sanctos illos, qui cum Christo resurrexerunt, Matt. 27, 53. cum eo quoque in coelum ascendisse, tamquam vivificae resurrectionis ejus testes et comites; quo etiam ab aliis refertur locus, Eph. 4, 8. *ascendens in altum captivam duxit captivitatem*, id est, a morte captivorum multitudinem: sed cum hic locus alias quoque expositiones Orthodoxas admittat, nos hic malumus ἐπέχειν; etsi non dubitemus, quin Christi in coelos ingressus, plenus gloria et congratulatione coelestium spirituum fuerit; quemadmodum in nativitate ejus est factum, ut clare id nobis, etsi allegorice, describitur Ps. 68, 18. Dan. 7, 13. atque alibi.

XVIII Negamus tamen contra Pontificios, patrum omnium ante Christi ascensum defunctorum animas, in limbo aliquo subterraneo ad hoc usque tempus fuisse detentas, ac tum demum a Christo liberatas atque in coelum ab ipso traductas. Nam nulla id ratio,* aut S. Scripturae locus evincit, et contra a nobis ostensum

movement can cover as much distance as there is between the highest heaven and the earth in the space of only four hours (as we know from the proportion of the radius and circumference of a circle), how much less a span of time did the now immortal and glorified body of Christ require to be drawn by his divine power from earth up to heaven, which is what Scripture testifies occurred as the apostles were looking on (Acts 1:10).[15]

17 Some debate whether Christ ascended into heaven all by himself or actually with a retinue in attendance, and in triumph. Acts 1 makes no mention of that retinue; but there are some theologians of great renown who conclude this from a comparison of some other places. They are of the opinion that those saints who arose from the dead along with Christ (in Matthew 27:53) also ascended into heaven with him, like witnesses and partakers of his life-giving resurrection. For this some others even refer to the place in Ephesians 4:8: "While ascending into heaven he led captivity captive," that is, leading a multitude of captives from death. But as this place permits also other orthodox explanations, we prefer to reserve judgment on this point. Yet we do not doubt that Christ's entry into heaven, as in what happened at his birth, was filled with glory and congratulation of the celestial spirits, as is clearly described—albeit allegorically—in Psalm 68:18, Daniel 7:13 and elsewhere.

18 However, over against the papal theologians we deny that the souls of all the fathers who had died before Christ's ascension had been kept in some underworldly Limbo until this time and only then did Christ himself set them free and bring them over to heaven.[16] For there is not any reason* and also no place in Holy Scripture that gives proof for this. We have shown the contrary, that

15 According to the geocentric cosmology there was a *primum mobile*, or 'highest moving heaven' beyond the sphere of the fixed stars; see Edward Grant, *Planets, Stars, and Orbs: The Medieval Cosmos, 1200–1687* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 316–323. Calculations differed about the distance of these spheres from the earth and, hence, about the absolute velocity of their rotation. However, the relative velocity is mathematically determined. If r is the distance between earth and the highest moving heaven, then the circumreference of that moving heaven is $2\pi r$. If π is rounded off to 3, it follows that the full rotation of the outermost heaven covers about six times the distance between that heaven and the earth. Thus, within four hours the heaven in its rotation covers the distance between heaven and earth. For a historical survey of cosmological discussions in the Netherlands during this period see Rienk Vermeij, *The Calvinist Copernicans. The Reception of the New Astronomy in the Dutch Republic, 1575–1750* (Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, 2002).

16 Walaeus refers to the theological doctrine of the so-called Limbo of the fathers, where the just of the Old Testament remained and were freed by Christ when he descended into hell; see *SPT* 27.26, 29.

est, Henoch et Eliam in coelum esse translatos, ut 2 Reg. 2, 1. et 11. disertis verbis asseritur, et Christus omnibus persecutionem pro justitia patientibus, longe ante mortem suam, *mercedem in coelis* promittit, Matt. 3, 10. et 12. atque ipsi latroni in cruce pendenti, quod *eodem die cum ipso futurus esset in paradiso*, Luc. 23, 43.

XIX Etsi vero Christus etiam post suum in coelos ascensum nonnunquam discipulis in Apostolorum actis, et nominatim Apostolo Paulo dicatur apparuisse, negamus tamen, propterea eum corpore suo reipsa extra coelum fuisse, quia comparitiones illae, vel ecstaticae fuerunt, vel in somnis, vel coelis apertis; Christum vero ipsum in coelis mansurum usque dum veniat judicatum vivos et mortuos, Scriptura diserte testatur, Act. 3, 21. et Phil. 3. v. ultimo, atque alibi.

XX Fructus ascensionis Christi sunt multi ac magni. Ejus enim ingressu coeleste nobis sacrarium apertum est, Joh 14, 2. Hebr. 9, 8., spes futurae nostrae haereditatis in capite nostro plenissime confirmata, et nos cum eo in coelis collocati, Eph. 2, 6. Spiritus Sancti effusio nobis impetrata, Joh. 16, 7. ac denique ejusdem virtute, corda et affectus* nostri sursum in coelum evecti, ut non quaeramus amplius ea quae in terris sunt, sed ea quae in coelis sunt, Col. 3, 1. 2. 3.

XXI Postremus exaltationis Christi gradus est, ejus ad dextram Dei sessio, de qua nobis in sequentibus agendum.

XXII Dextra Dei, hoc loco proprie* accipi non potest,* cum Deus sit Spiritus, ac proinde carnem et ossa non habeat; sed metaphorice sumitur, pro summo illo glorificationis gradu, in quem Christus a Patre, post passionem et ascensum ejus in coelos, est evectus.

XXIII Metaphora autem haec est sumpta a consuetudine Regum ac Principum; qui solio suo insidentes, aut coram tribunali suo jus dicentes, eos quos summo post ipsos honore afficiunt, aut quos regni sui participes faciunt, ad dextram suam collocare solent, quemadmodum hoc in omnibus principatibus consuetum. Sic Rex Salomon insidens solio suo Matrem suam ad dextram suam collocavit, 1 Reg. 2, 19. Sic Ps. 45, 10. Regina ad dextram Regis sui constituitur. Sic Mater

Enoch and Elijah were transported to heaven, as 2 Kings 2:1 and 11 assert with so many words. And Christ, long before his death, promised that there would be "a reward in heaven" (Matthew 3:10 and 12) for all who suffer persecution for the sake of righteousness; and to the robber who was hanging on the cross, he promised that "on this same day he would be with him in Paradise" (Luke 23:43).

19 And even though it states in the Acts of the apostles that even after his ascension into heaven Christ sometimes appeared to his disciples, and particularly to the apostle Paul, we nevertheless deny that his body was therefore actually outside heaven, because those appearances were either in a trance, or in dreams, or as the heavens were opened.[17] But Scripture expressly testifies that Christ himself will remain in heaven until he will come to judge the living and the dead (Acts 3:21, and the ending of Philippians 3, and elsewhere).

20 There are many, great fruits of Christ's ascension. For with his entry he opened the heavenly sanctuary for us (John 14:2; Hebrews 9:8); he ensured the hope of our future inheritance in our head [Christ], and our being seated with him in the heavenly places (Ephesians 2:6). He obtained for us the outpouring of the Holy Spirit (John 16:7); and lastly, by his power our hearts and desires* are lifted up into heaven, so that we no longer seek the things that are on earth but the things which are in heaven (Colossians 3:1–3).[18]

21 The final step of Christ's exaltation is his sitting down at God's right hand, and we shall deal with it in what follows.

22 On this point "the right hand of God" cannot* be taken in its literal sense,* because God is Spirit and so he lacks flesh and bones; rather, it is taken metaphorically, to stand for that highest step of glorification to which the Father raised Christ up after his passion and ascension into heaven.

23 Moreover, this metaphor is derived from the practice of kings and rulers whose custom it is, when they take their seat upon the throne and administer justice before their court of law, to give a place at their right hand to people on whom they bestow the highest honor (next to their own), or whom they make partakers of their kingly rule, as this is the convention in all dominions. And so when king Solomon sat on his throne he placed his mother at his right hand (1 Kings 2:19). Similarly, in Psalm 45:10 the queen is placed at the right hand of her king. In this way also the mother of the sons of Zebedee in Matthew 20:21

17 The references are to Paul's experience in the temple Acts 22:17, where the Greek expression (*en ekstasei*) is used, and possibly to the appearances to Paul at night (Acts 18:9) and to Stephen, Paul and John from heaven (Acts 7:56, 2 Cor. 12:2 and Rev. 1:12).

18 The *Heidelberg Catechism*, Question and Answer 49, offers a similar survey of the benefits of Christ's ascension.

filiorum Zebedaei, Matt. 20, 21. postulavit a Christo, ut unus ad dextram, alter ad sinistram illius, in ejus regno sederet.

XXIV Significat* ergo haec sessio Christi ad dextram Patris, non proprie* gloriam illam et regnum naturale,* quod Filio Dei cum Patre ab aeterno fuit commune,* hoc enim pacto etiam Spiritus Sanctus ad dextram Dei sederet: sed regnum oeconomicum* et voluntarium, in quo tamquam θεάνθρωπος, et Mediator noster, ad Ecclesiae suae collectionem ac defensionem a Patre est constitutus: unde Apostolus Paulus *ei omnia a Patre esse subjecta* asserit, *excepto tamen eo qui ei omnia subjecit*, 1 Cor. 15, 27.

XXV Complectitur ergo sessio Christi ad dextram Patris, haec duo: Primo, gloriam illam et honorem supremum, quo nomen supra omne nomen accepit, et longe supra Angelos, atque alias quasvis creaturas est evectus et illarum haeres ac caput est factus, quemadmodum Apostolus id perspicue explicat, Eph. 1, 20. 21. 22. Phil. 2, 9. 10. 11. Hebr. 2, 7. 8, atque alibi, unde et ad Heb. 1, 3. dextra μεγαλωσύνης, id est, majestatis, Heb. 8, 1 dextra μεγαλωσύνης τοῦ θρόνου, et Hebr. 12, 2. dextra Throni Dei appellatur.

XXVI Sed haec Christi capitis gloria, non est titularis, sed cum potestate et imperio in omnes creaturas etiam conjuncta; qua tamquam Rex et gubernator omnium, verbo et Spiritu suo Ecclesiam efficaciter e mundo colligit, et potentia* sua adversus mundum et Satanam conservat ac tuetur; idque donec de hostibus omnibus plene triumphabit.

XXVII Demonstrant* illud, praeter locos supra citatos, comparatio Ps. 110, 1. cum 1 Cor. 15, 25. Nam pro verbis illis, quae Ps. 110, 1. sic enunciantur, *Sede ad dextram meam, donec posuero inimicos tuos in scabellum pedum tuorum*, Apostolus haec tamquam aequivalentia substituit, 1 Cor. 15, 25. *Oportet ipsum regnare, donec posuerit omnes inimicos sub pedibus suis*, unde et Matt. 20, 64. Marc. 14, 62. vocatur dextra δυνάμεως, *potentiae Dei* et Matt. 28, 18. *omnis potestas in coelo et in terra*.

XXVIII Quaeritur hic secundum quam naturam* Christus proprie* ad dextram Dei sedeat; et recte respondetur, secundum utramque. Nam quemadmodum Christus Mediator est constitutus secundum utramque naturam, divina faciente quod suum est, humana quod est suum: ita quoque secundum utramque Rex noster est constitutus, cum hoc tamen discrimine, quod divina natura nulla hic nova dona accepit, sed ejus gloriae ac potentiae* quam ab aeterno possedit, novum usum ac manifestationem, secundum Patris voluntatem* et salutis nostrae oeconomiam,* ut Christus ipse rogat, Joh. 17, 5. *Pater glorifica me*

desired of Christ that in his kingdom the one might sit at his right hand and the other at his left.

24 And so this sitting down of Christ at the right hand of his Father does not strictly* mean* that glory and natural* kingdom which the Son of God shares* with the Father from eternity, for if that were the case then also the Holy Spirit should have his seat at the right hand of God. But it means the economic* and voluntary kingdom in which Christ was established as the God-and-man and our Mediator, for the gathering and defense of his Church. Therefore the apostle Paul asserts that "the Father has put all things under his feet, except him who has made all things subject to him" (1 Corinthians 15:27).

25 And so the sitting down by Christ at the Father's right hand encompasses these two things: first, that glory and supreme honor whereby he has received the name that surpasses every name, and whereby he was raised up far above the angels and all other creatures and became their heir and head, as the apostle clearly explains (Ephesians 1:20–22; Philippians 2:9–11; Hebrews 2:7–8 and elsewhere). For this reason also Hebrews 1:3 speaks of the "right hand of the majesty," and Hebrews 8:1, "the right hand of the majesty of the throne," and Hebrews 12:2, "the right hand of the throne of God."

26 This glory of Christ as Head is not merely in name only, but it is also accompanied by power and rule over all creatures. With this, as the King and Ruler over all things, he effectively gathers the Church out of the world by his Word and Spirit, and by his power* he keeps it safe and guards it against the world and against Satan, and he does so until he will triumph completely over all his enemies.

27 In addition to the places cited above this actual power and rule is demonstrated* by a comparison of Psalm 110:1 and 1 Corinthians 15:25. For the words that are expressed as follows in Psalm 110:1: "Sit at my right hand until I shall make your enemies a footstool for your feet," are given by the apostle thus as an equivalent substitute: "For he must reign until he has put all his enemies under his feet" (1 Corinthians 15:25). Therefore also Matthew 26:64 and Mark 14:62 call it "the right hand of God's power" and Matthew 28:18, "all power in heaven and on earth."

28 At this point the question arises: in which nature* did Christ, strictly* speaking, sit down at the right hand of God? And the correct answer is: in both natures.* For just as Christ was established as Mediator in both natures (as each nature, the divine and the human, performed what belonged to it), so he was established as our King in both natures,* albeit with the difference that his divine nature received no new gifts here, other than a renewed use and manifestation of the glory and power* which he had from eternity, according to the Father's will* and the economy* of our salvation, as Christ himself asks in John

apud temetipsum ea gloria, quam habui apud te antequam hic mundus esset; sed humana natura utrumque accepit a Patre, nempe gloriam ac potestatem atque usum eorum, ut ex Matt. 28. Phil. 2. Hebr. 2. atque aliis locis est colligere.

XXIX Quaeritur etiam, an Christus hanc gloriam humanae naturae* suae, per passionem et mortem proprie* loquendo meruerit? Etsi vero adversus eos qui hoc asserunt, valde nolimus contendere, quum certum sit Christum dignitate meriti sui eam nobis acquisivisse, existimamus tamen, contrariam sententiam. quae est plurimorum reformatorum scriptorium, firmioribus argumentis niti; imprimis vero, quia haec gloria jure unionis hypostaticae,* et tamquam vera Filii haereditas ei debebatur, Ps. 2, 7. et 8. Heb. 1. 2. ac proinde quemadmodum ipsa unio hypostatica,* omnium Theologorum consensu, nullam meriti rationem subit, ita nec illa, quae eam necessario, et ex divino decreto sunt consecuta, unde et voce* χαρίσασθαι, in hoc negotio Apostolus Paulus utitur, Phil. 2, 9.

XXX Quod vero quidam inter Ubiquitarios contendunt, corpus Christi per hanc ad dextram Dei sessionem, omnibus locis in coelo atque in terra praesens esse factum, praeterquam quod reliquorum, qui hanc, quam fingunt omnipraesentiam, ex unione hypostatica* arcessunt, fundamenta* evertit, contradicunt diversis et perspicuis Sacrae Scripturae locis, qui unius tantum in hunc mundum reditus Christi mentionem faciunt, quando scilicet ad finem seculi in gloria sua apparebit.

17:5: "Father, glorify me in your presence with the glory I had with you before the world began." Yet it was his human nature that received both from the Father, the glory and the power (as well as the use of them), as can be gleaned from Matthew 28, Philippians 2, Hebrews 2 and other places.

The question also arises, whether it was strictly* speaking through his pas- 29
sion and death that Christ merited this glory for his human nature.* And whereas we really do not wish to enter into a dispute with those who make this claim,[19] since Christ certainly did obtain it for us by the worthiness of what he merited, yet we are of the opinion that the opposite point of view, which is shared by many Reformed writers, rests upon arguments that are stronger. The chief one of these is that this glory was owed to Christ by the right of his hypostatic* union, and as the Son's rightful inheritance (Psalm 2:7,8; Hebrews 1:2). And so, by the consensus of all theologians, that hypostatic* union does not follow upon any merit, nor the things which necessarily and by God's decree followed it—which is why the apostle Paul also uses the word* "to bestow as gift" in this context (Philippians 2:9).

But as to the fact that some of the Ubiquitarians maintain that by this 30
sitting down at God's right hand Christ's body became present in all places in heaven and on earth,[20] besides the fact that it fundamentally* overturns other Ubiquitarians who derive this imaginary omnipresence from the hypostatic* union, they are in disagreement with various obvious places in Holy Scripture, as these mention only one return of Christ into this world, i.e., when he will appear in glory at the end of the age.

---

19 According to John Calvin it is curiosity to ask whether Christ merited anything for himself. Still many Reformed theologians held that the exaltation of Christ was merited by his passion and death. Remarkably, in his explanation of Isaiah 53, first published in 1625 together with his commentary on Hosea, Andreas Rivetus, co-author of the *Synopsis*, takes the position that is carefully rejected here. Andreas Rivetus, *Opera theologica* (Rotterdam: Arnoldus Leers, 1652), 2:836–837. For the reference to Rivetus and for a list of other Reformed theologians who held this position see Bavinck, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 3:433.

20 From 1616 until 1625 there was a severe and public controversy between the Lutheran universities of Giessen and Tübingen on the question of the ubiquity of Christ's humanity. Both schools agreed that Christ's humanity possessed the divine attribute of ubiquity from the very beginning of the incarnation. However, the Tübingen School, following the thought of Brenz, maintained that Christ's human nature was actually omnipresent by the very fact of the hypostatic union. Following Chemnitz, the Giessen school taught that Christ voluntarily gave up the actual exercise of his human omnipresence through his *kenosis*, only to resume it after his exaltation to the right hand of the Father. Cf. Haga, *Was there a Lutheran Metaphysics?*, 213–271. On ubiquitarianism in general see *SPT* 25 antithesis 4.iii, note 47.

XXXI Fructus atque effectus hujus sessionis Christi ad dextram Patris, quotidie sentit Ecclesia, et hostes Christi, ipseque adeo Satanas, velint nolint, admirantur et contremiscunt. Ecclesiam enim suam verbo ac Spiritu suo, illis frustra adversantibus, colligit, adversus totius mundi tyrannidem atque inferorum portas conservat, Antichristum spiritu oris sui conficit; et quemadmodum benignitatem suam, ac gratiae suae divitias veris Ecclesiae membris, tum in ipsorum conscientiis, tum in ipsorum externo statu, quotidie magis ac magis explicat, ita etiam manifesta judicii venturi signa, adversus istorum plurimos indies manifestat.

XXXII Haec autem omnia nituntur intercessione illa, qua Christus non tantum in statu suo humili, sed vel imprimis in statu illo suo glorioso, apud Patrem intercedit, Rom. 8, 34. Heb. 7, 25. 1Joh. 2, 1. etc.

XXXIII Haec autem Christi intercessio in coelis ad dextram Dei, non est unica et sola actio sacerdotis Christi, ut impius Socinus fingit, sed actionum sacerdotalium una; qua postquam se ipsum in terris extra sacrarium coeleste, hostiam propitiatoriam pro peccatis nostris obtulit, in ipso coelo coram facie Patris interpellat, idque adversus Satanam atque ejus instrumenta, et pro Ecclesia atque ejus membris, quemadmodum utriusque egregius typus nobis proponitur Zach. 3, 2. et seqq.

XXXIV Consistit autem haec intercessio seu interpellatio Christi in hisce tribus: I. Quod Christus hostiam suam propitiatoriam in ipsum sacrarium coeleste, illud nobis sanctificaturus, intulerit, et ibi compareat coram facie Dei pro nobis, Heb. 9, 23. 24. II. Quod voluntate* ac desiderio suo ardenti, quemadmodum in terris antea fecerat, Joh. 17, 11. 15. 24. etc. ita et in coelis apud Patrem, mortis suae vim atque efficaciam nobis ad salutem applicari postulet, ut Zach. 1, 12. et Joh. 14, 16. item Act. 2, 33. videre est. Denique, quod merito ac desiderio suo, nostras preces in nomine ejus effusas, Deo Patri gratas et acceptas reddat, Joh. 14, 6. et 13. item 1Joh. 2,1. et 2.

XXXV Quorum omnium elegans typus, explicante ipso Apostolo Paulo, Heb. 7. et 9. fuit ingressus summi sacerdotis in sanctum sanctorum, ipso die propitiationis. Nam I. sacrificium expiatorium extra sacrarium offerebatur, et ejus sanguis

Every day the Church experiences the fruits and effects of Christ's sitting 31
down at the Father's right hand; and the enemies of Christ, including even Satan himself, whether they like it or not, marvel at it, and tremble. For Christ gathers his Church by his Word and Spirit, while they vainly resist; he preserves it against the tyranny of the whole world and the gates of hell, and he destroys the Antichrist by the spirit of his mouth. And just as he daily more and more unfolds his kindness and the riches of his grace to those who are true members of the Church (both in their consciences and in their outward status), so he also daily manifests the clear signs that the judgment is coming against a great many of [the enemies].

What is more, all these fruits rest upon that intercession whereby Christ 32
intercedes before the Father not just in his state of humility but especially in that state of his glorification (Romans 8:34, Hebrews 7:25, 1John 2:1, etc.).

And this intercession by Christ in heaven at God's right hand is not the only, 33
single action of Christ as priest, as the godless Socinus imagines,[21] but it is one of his [many] priestly actions. By this, after he offered himself on earth outside the heavenly sanctuary as the atoning sacrificial victim for our sins, he also appeals in the presence of the Father's countenance in heaven. And he does so against Satan and all his instruments, and on behalf of the Church and its members, in the manner of which Zechariah 3:2 ff. presents us with an outstanding example for each.

And this intercession, or appeal, by Christ consists of these three features: 34
1) that Christ brought his atoning sacrifice into the very sanctuary of heaven to sanctify it for us, and there to appear before the face of God on our behalf (Hebrews 9:23–24). 2) that by his will* and burning desire, just as he had done earlier while on earth (John 17:11, 15, 24, etc.) so also in heaven with the Father he asks earnestly that the power and efficacy of his death be applied to us for our salvation, as can be seen from Zechariah 1:12 and John 14:16 as well as Acts 2:33. Finally, 3) that by what he has merited and his own desire, he causes the prayers that we pour out in his name to be pleasing and acceptable to God the Father (John 14:6 and 13, likewise 1John 2:1,2).

The entry by the great high-priest into the holy of holies on that day of atone- 35
ment formed a representation of all these features, as the apostle Paul himself points out in Hebrews 7 and 9. For 1) the atoning sacrifice was offered outside

21 According to Socinus, Christ's death on the cross was the consummation of his obedience and exemplary instruction as a prophet; at his ascension he displayed his sacrifice as a high priest to God and then assumed the final office of king; see George Huntston Williams, *The Radical Reformation*, 3rd rev. ed. (Kirksville: Truman State University Press, 2000), 1168.

deinde in sacrarium ab eodem inferebatur. II. suffitus sanguini illi conjungebatur, per quem vota ac preces figurabantur, ut explicatur Apoc. 8, 3. ac denique humeris, ac pectore suo, nomina tribuum Israëlis gestabat, pro quibus propitiatio typica procurabatur.

XXXVI Extremus hujus regni sacerdotalis actus,* erit judicium extremum; quando e coelo ad judicandum vivos et mortuos redibit, et omnes tam boni, quam pravi, coram ipsius tribunali comparere cogentur, ut unusquisque referat quod fecerit in corpore suo, sive bonum, sive malum, 2 Cor. 5, 10. ac tum denique deposita hac oeconomica regnandi forma, tamquam omnium victor ac triumphator, primo se ipsum, ac deinde hoc regnum tradet Deo et Patri, ut Deus deinceps sit omnia in omnibus, 1 Cor. 15, 24. et 28.

the sanctuary and then his blood was taken from there into the sanctuary by the same person. 2) the incense was joined to his blood, as it was a symbol of the offerings and prayers, as Revelation 8:3 explains. And he also bore upon his shoulders and breast the names of the tribes of Israel, for whom the foreshadowing atonement was obtained.

The final deed* of his reign as priest will be the last judgment, when he will 36
come again from heaven to judge the living and the dead, and all people, good as well as evil, shall be gathered together to appear before his judgment seat, for everyone to give an account of what he has done in the body, whether good or evil (2 Corinthians 5:10). And then at last, when he lays aside his reign as formed by this economy,* like a victor of all things and a conqueror he will first hand himself, and then his reign, over to God and the Father, so that God may be all in all (1 Corinthians 15:24, 28).

DISPUTATIO XXIX

De Satisfactione Jesu Christi

Praeside D. ANTONIO THYSIO
Respondente ISAACO PLANCIO

THESIS I Hucusque de Personae* Filii Dei incarnatione, ejusque fine,* nempe officio, officiique partibus actibusque, et ad illius exsecutionem vario statu, tum humili, tum glorioso, actum fuit; sequitur ut *satisfactionem*, quae a persona officioque ejus, imprimis sacerdotali, dependet, exsequamur.

II *Satisfactionis* vocabulum in sacris ad homines relatum, raro occurrit, uti et satisfacere, Graecis ἱκανὸν ποιῆσαι, Marc. 15, 15. Est autem id tantum facere, quantum postulanti, aut laeso iratoque atque expostulanti satis est; seu desiderium alicujus implere, quod generaliter fit verbis* vel factis. Ad debitum relatum, est illud exsolvere; quae solutio duplex: impropria et catachrestica, acceptilatio scilicet, quae ficta est et imaginaria solutio, dum acceptum refertur, et pro soluto habetur, quod revera non est solutum; vel vera et proprie* dicta, quae est plena et adaequata persolutio. Quo sensu hic a nobis accipitur.

DISPUTATION 29

On the Satisfaction by Jesus Christ

President: Antonius Thysius
Respondent: Isaac Plancius[1]

Until now we have treated the incarnation of the person* of God's Son, and the goal* for it—i.e., his office and its parts and deeds, and also the different states for carrying it out (the humiliated and the glorified one). It follows that we now undertake to study the satisfaction that depends on his person and office, in particular his priestly office. 1

In Holy Scripture the word 'satisfaction' rarely occurs when it refers to people, so too the expression 'to make satisfaction' (in Greek: *hikanon poiēsai*, Mark 15:15). It means: to do as much as is enough in the eyes of the person who requests it, or enough for the one who demands it after he has been offended or angered. It can also mean to fulfill someone's wish, and that is generally done in words* or in deeds. When it refers to a debt, it means to pay for it, and this payment takes one of two forms. Taken loosely (by catachresis) as 'acceptilation,' satisfaction is a fictitious, nominal payment that one has accepted and deems to be paid, while in fact it has not been paid. Or, taken in the genuine, strict sense,* the word means a full and adequate payment. It is in this sense that we take the word here.[2] 2

1 Born in Amsterdam in 1600 Isaac Plancius, son of Petrus, matriculated on June 12, 1619 in theology. He defended this disputation in 1622. He was ordained as minister in Heemstede and Bennebroek (1625) and Gouda (1626). He died in 1631. See Du Rieu, *Album studiosorum*, 141 and Van Lieburg, *Repertorium*, 193.

2 In Roman civil law, *acceptilatio* is the form of words by which a creditor releases his debtor from a debt or obligation, and acknowledges he has received that which in fact he has not received. *Acceptilatio* could imply a partial as well as a total release. In the theology of John Duns Scotus, *acceptatio* denotes the act of God by which the merit of Jesus Christ was accepted as sufficient for the salvation of humankind. This Scotist notion was perceived in later Socinian and Arminian theology as a merely arbitrary acceptance of Christ's death as if there is no 'convenience' or 'necessity' in it; instead Scotus had argued that one perfect act of love by a free human will, which in turn is a gift of divine grace, would suffice to satisfy God's righteousness, and that the power and effect of Christ's suffering even go beyond this kind of satisfaction. See Antonie Vos and others (eds.), *Duns Scotus on Divine Love: Texts and Commentary on Goodness and Freedom, God and Humans* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), 89–129. Strehle, *Catholic Roots*, 67–70, argues that after Desiderius Erasmus introduced the notion of *acceptilatio* in his rendering of Romans 4:3, Philipp Melanchthon took it over

III Haec porro vox* relata ad debitum nostrum erga Deum, quo obligamur ad debitum justitiae seu obedientiae ejus praestandum, vel ad debitum poenae, sive per nos, sive per alium ferendum, et, si fieri potest,* exhauriendum, in Scriptura non occurrit; sed aequipollentes obviae sunt, ut λύτρωσις, ἀπολύτρωσις, *redemptio, persolutio*, atque similes, quae Christo vadi ac sponsori nostro tribuuntur.

IV Est autem *Satisfactio*, Christi θεανθρώπου, id est, Dei et hominis actio, qua is ex divino, benevolo ac justo decreto, pro sua erga Patrem obedientia, et erga homines caritate, se ipsum ultro ac sponte vadem et sponsorem pro nobis, nostro scilicet loco et bono, sistens, pro nobis poenas omnes luit peccatis nostris debitas, easque perferendo et exhauriendo, divinae justitiae satisfecit, meritoque suo nos ab ira, maledictione Dei, ac morte aeterna liberavit, justitiam ac vitam aeternam acquisivit, ad justitiae misericordiaeque Dei declarationem nostramque salutem.

V *Causa** *efficiens* ejus *prima*, est Deus voluntate,* beneplacito et decreto suo, cum justo, tum benevolo; id justum, quod satisfactionem fieri voluerit; misericors quod taliter, videlicet, cum id a nobis exigere jure potuisset,* Filium ei rei destinarit et dederit, Esa. 53, 10. *Voluit Deus contundere ipsum, et impegit in eum omnium nostrorum peccata*, et vers. 4. *afflictus et percussus Dei* dicitur. Joh. 3, 16. et Rom. 8, 32. *Deus proprio Filio non pepercit, sed pro nobis omnibus tradidit eum.* 2 Cor. 5. *Deus erat in Christo reconcilians sibi mundum*, et,[a] *fecit eum pro nobis peccatum*.

[a] etc.: 1652.

and developed it further in his 'forensic' doctrine of justification. For further discussion see antithesis 2 below. A detailed survey of Erasmus's influence on the understanding of 'imputation', 'acceptilation' and related notions is provided by Gert van den Brink, *Tot zonde gemaakt: De Engelse antinomiaanse controverse (1690–1700) over de toerekening van de zonden aan Christus, met bijzondere aandacht voor Herman Witsius'* Animadversiones Irenicae (*1696*) (Kampen: Summum Academic, 2016), 99–113.

Well then, the word* does not occur in Scripture as referring to the debt we 3
owe to God, by which we are bound to perform the required righteousness or obedience to God, or are bound to bear the required punishment—if it were possible,* until it is completely removed—whether by ourselves or through someone else. But other words of equal force appear readily, such as 'redemption,' 'full payment,' and the like, and these are attributed to Christ as our surety and bondsman.

'Satisfaction,' then, is a deed of Christ the God-and-man (i.e., a deed of God 4
and man),[3] whereby he according to the divine, favorable, and just decree, and out of his own obedience to the Father and love towards mankind, willingly and freely made himself to stand as the surety and bondsman on our behalf (that is, in our place and for our good). On our behalf he paid all the penalties that were owed for our sins, and by bearing and removing them he made full satisfaction to God's justice, and by his own merits he set us free from God's wrath and curse, and from eternal death. He obtained righteousness and eternal life for the proclamation of God's righteousness and mercy, as well as for our salvation.

The primary efficient cause* of this [satisfaction] is God, through his will,* 5
his good pleasure, and his just and favorable decree.[4] It is just, because it was his will that satisfaction be made; it was merciful, because it was made in such a way that while by rights he could* have made the requirement from us, he destined and gave his Son for that task. Isaiah 53:10: "It was God's will to strike him, and he fastened the sins of us all upon him." And verse 14: "He is called afflicted and smitten by God." John 3:16 and Romans 8:32: "God did not spare his own Son, but gave him up for us all." 2 Corinthians 5[:19]: "God was reconciling the world to himself in Christ" and "He made him to be sin for us."

---

3 This reflects the ground-breaking discussion of the doctrine of salvation by Anselm in his *Cur Deus homo* (1094–1098). Anselm's argument can be summarized as follows: 1) It is necessary that man be redeemed; 2) This redemption is impossible without satisfaction in terms of complying with God's righteousness or honor; 3) Only God can give full satisfaction; 4) The suffering of Christ—being God and man at once—is the most appropriate way of giving satisfaction to God. The classic dogma of the two natures of Jesus Christ is strongly connected here to the performance of his task as our Redeemer. In the remainder of the definition in thesis 4, Thysius provides important qualifications to this understanding of the necessity of satisfaction. Satisfaction is a free and loving act of God's will, God acting *ad extra*. It belongs to the contingent salvation history of the *Deus-homo*, the God-and-man. See also the discussion on the necessity of satisfaction in thesis 34 below.

4 Thysius begins his analysis of satisfaction with the efficient cause in thesis 5. The material content is expounded in thesis 13, the formal aspect in thesis 22, and the final cause in thesis 29.

VI *Causa* efficiens proxima*, est ipse Christus, θεάνθρωπος, Dei et hominis Filius, adeoque Deus et homo, et oeconomiae* mediator, qui solus, hac personae* constitutione, comparatus et idoneus fuit ad hoc ipsum praestandum, Gal. 2, 20. *Christus dedit sese pro nobis*, et quidem secundum utramque naturam,* unaquaque hic agente quod suum, humana quae sunt hominis, divina, quae Dei, et una cum communione alterius, ita ut salvis utriusque naturae proprietatibus, una natura cum altera concurrerit ad idem obedientiae, meriti, satisfactionis ἀποτέλεσμα et opus θεανδρικόν. Ut enim incarnatus est, ut esset noster redemptor, ita etiam utriusque naturae proprietas huic actui deserviit, ab humana pretium, a divina hujus pretii quantitas et qualitas,* infinitas* scilicet, et ἀξίωσις, seu dignitas existit. Unde per Spiritum aeternum sese obtulisse Deo dicitur, Heb. 9, 14. et *Dominus gloriae crucifixus*, 1 Cor. 2, 8.

VII Et quidem id praestitit *volens et sponte sua*, sine ulla coactione, Esa. 53, 7. *Oblatus est quia ipse voluit*. et v. 10. et 12. *Posuit pro peccato, et tradidit in mortem animam suam*. Joh. 10, 15. *Ego pono animam pro ovibus*. Et v. 18. *Nemo tollit eam a me, sed ego pono eam a memetipso. Ipse potestatem habeo ponendi eam, et rursus assumendi*. Deoque promptissimo obsequio obediens, Luc. 22. *Pater, si fieri potest, transfer calicem istum a me. Veruntamen non mea voluntas, sed tua fiat*. Joh. 18. *An non bibam poculum quod dedit mihi Pater?* Phil. 2, 8. *Factus obediens usque ad mortem*. Psal. 40. et Heb. 10, 7. *Corpus aptasti mihi; Tunc dixi, ecce adsum ut faciam Deus voluntatem tuam*.

VIII *Causa* interna* quidem quae Deum movit, tum ab una parte, est benignitas, gratia, misericordia ac φιλανθρωπία et supereminens caritas Dei erga homines, Joh. 3, 16. *Ita dilexit Deus mundum, ut Filium suum daret*. Rom. 5, 8. *Commendat Deus caritatem suam erga nos, quod cum peccatores essemus, Christus pro nobis mortuus est*; tum ab altera, Dei justitia, cui satisfieri oportebat, ut misericordia exerceri posset*,[a] et ejus effectum consequeretur. Est enim hic utriusque temperamentum, Rom. 3, 25. 26.

IX Causa* vero *interna, quae Dei Filium Jesum Christum movit*, fuit similiter ineffabilis ejus amor erga suos, et quos ei dedit Pater, Joh. 15, 13. *Ego dilexi*

[a] possit*: 1642.

The proximate* efficient cause* is Christ himself, the God-and-man, Son of 6
God and of man, and so both God and man, the intermediary of the salvation-economy.* He alone, in this constitution of person,* was prepared and well-suited to perform this office; Galatians 2:20: "Christ gave himself for us." He gave himself in both natures, with each here doing its own work—the human what belongs to mankind, and the divine what is of God—and the one in communion with the other, so that (with the exception of each nature's own properties) the one nature came together with the other nature for the same result to accomplish the obedience, merit, and satisfaction—the work of the God-and-man. For just as he became incarnate in order to become our Redeemer, so also the property of each nature served this task: from his human nature came the payment, while from his divine nature came the quantity and quality*—obviously the infinitude*—and the value or dignity of the paid price.[5] Therefore it says that it was through the eternal Spirit that he offered himself to God (Hebrews 9:14), and "the Lord of glory was crucified" (1Corinthians 2:8).

Moreover, he performed this "willingly and of his own accord," without any 7
compulsion. Isaiah 53:7: "He was offered up because it was his will to do so." And verse 10 and 12: "He laid down his life for sin and handed his soul over to death." John 10:15: "I lay down my life for my sheep;" verse 18: "No-one takes it from me, but I lay it down of my own accord. I have the authority to lay it down and to take it up again." And, [he was] obedient to God with a very prompt obedience; Luke 22[:42]: "Father, if it is possible, remove this cup from me. Yet not my will, but your will be done." John 18[:11]: "Shall I not drink the cup the Father has given me?" Philippians 2:8: "He became obedient even unto death." Psalm 40[:6 and 8] and Hebrews 10:[5 and] 7: "You have prepared a body for me; then I said, 'behold I have come to do your will, O God'."

And as for the internal cause* that moved God, on the one hand it was 8
the loving-kindness, grace, mercy, philanthropy, and the exceeding love of God towards mankind. John 3:16: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his own Son." Romans 5:8: "God commends his love towards us in that while we were sinners, Christ died for us." However, on the other hand there is [the internal cause of] God's justice, which needed to be satisfied so that his mercy could* be exercised and its effect achieved. For here we have to do with a good mix of both [mercy and justice] (Romans 3:25–26).

And as for the true internal cause* that moved God's Son Jesus Christ, it, 9
similarly, is his inexpressible love towards those who belong to him, and whom

5 The discussion of Christ's work of satisfaction presupposes the exposition of Christology, presented in disputation 25 above, in terms of the divine and human natures and of the personal unity.

vos, majorem hac caritatem nemo habet, quam ut quis animam suam ponat pro amicis suis. Eph. 5, 2. *Christus dilexit nos, et tradidit semetipsum pro nobis oblationem, et victimam Deo*. et v. 25. *Christus dilexit Ecclesiam, et tradidit se pro ea*. Gal, 2, 20. *Filius Dei amavit me, et tradidit semetipsum pro me*, etc.

x *Causa* externa* satisfactionis, a Patre decretae, et a Filio susceptae, est miseria nostra, id est, peccata, et quidem aeternam poenam promerentia et exigentia, in quam miseratio Dei ferebatur, et ob quam poenas omnes nobis debitas subiit Filius Dei, ut per eum pristinae felicitati restitueremur, Esa. 53, 5. *Et ipse vulneratus, seu dolore affectus est a praevaricationibus nostris, et attritus est ab iniquitatibus nostris*, et v. 8. *A praevaricatione populi mei plaga fuit ei*; quibus locis מן a vel ab, ex sermonis* Hebraei proprietate, 70[a] reddunt διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας καὶ ἀνομίας, propter peccata, iniquitates nostras, Rom. 4, 25. *Traditus* (*Christus scilicet, in manus peccatorum et mortem*) *διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα, propter offensas nostras*. Ubi διὰ cum accusativo causam* notat antecedentem et impellentem. Atque ita accipitur plurimum, praesertim cum conjungitur cum perpessionibus.

xi Similiter Scriptura Sacra hic utitur ὑπὲρ et περὶ, *super*, pro seu ob, eodem sensu, 1Cor. 15, 3. Christus *mortuus est ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν, pro peccatis nostris*. Gal. 1, 4. *Dedit semetipsum pro vel ob peccata nostra*. Heb. 10, 12. *Christus obtulit sacrificium pro peccatis*. Et 1Pet. 3, 18. *Christus semel περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν, ob peccata passus est, justus, ὑπὲρ, pro injustis*. Ubi ὑπὲρ et περὶ Latinis ob et pro, praesertim relatae ad rem, significant* non minus causam* impulsivam, quam finalem, quae etiam impulsivae rationem habet.

xii Intelligenda ergo istis loquendi rationibus, a et *pro* peccatis, *ob* et *propter* peccata, causa* impulsiva et quidem meritoria, id est, qua poenam peccatis nostris debitam respicit, peccatis nostris ita merentibus; non autem tantum occasio qualiscunque, ut infaustus ille Socinus nugatur. Quae tamen si in causis

[a] '70' is an abbreviation of the *Septuagint*.

the Father has given to him: "I have loved you; greater love has no-one than this: to lay down one's life for one's friends" (John 15:13). Ephesians 5:2: "Christ loved us, and he gave himself up for us as an offering and sacrifice to God." And verse 25: "Christ loved the Church and he gave himself for her." Galatians 2:20: "The Son of God loved me, and he gave himself for me," etc.

The outward cause* for the satisfaction as determined by the Father and 10
taken up by the Son is our wretchedness, that is, our sins, which deserved and required everlasting punishment. For this God was moved to pity and for this the Son of God underwent all the punishment that was owed to us, so that through him we might be restored to our former happiness; Isaiah 53:5: "And he was wounded, or affected by grief, because of our transgressions, and he was smitten by our iniquities," and verse 8: "He was struck by the transgressions of my people." In this place the Septuagint translates the Hebrew word* *min*, 'by' (Latin: *a* or *ab*)—a peculiarity of the Hebrew language—as 'because of' our sins, and 'because of' our transgressions (*dia tas hamartias kai anomias*). Thus in Romans 4:25: "He (i.e., Christ) was delivered into the hands of sinners and to death" (*dia ta paraptōmata*), "because of our offenses," where *dia* with the accusative case means the prior, driving cause.* And it is used this way in many places, especially whenever it occurs in conjunction with sufferings.

On this point Holy Scripture similarly uses *huper* and *peri* in the same 11
sense of 'over,' 'for,' 'because of.' 1 Corinthians 15:3: "Christ died for our sins (*huper hamartiōn*)." Galatians 1:4: "He gave himself for (or because of) our sins." Hebrews 10:12: "Christ offered the sacrifice for sins." And 1 Peter 3:18: "Christ suffered once and for all (*peri hamartiōn*), for sins, the just for (*huper*) the unjust." Here *huper* and *peri* (in Latin *ob* and *pro*) especially when they refer to this case, mean* no less the impelling cause than the final cause* which includes the sense of the impelling one.[6]

And so with those ways of expressing it we should understand 'by' and 'for' 12
sins, 'because of' and 'on account of' sins, as the impelling cause* as well as the meritorious cause, i.e., the cause which keeps the punishment owed for our sins in view, and not only an occasion of whatever kind, as that miscreant Socinus nonsensically says.[7] However, if [an occasion] does belong among the causes,

6 The impelling cause indicates the occasion or incentive for action. Properly speaking, God does not act on impulse, but our sinful condition is the external occasion at which God's goodness operates. As the statement of thesis 11 makes clear, the incentive or reason for acting is intimately connected with the goal or end of the action. Our *sins* are the reason why Christ suffers, and the *removal* of sin by way of satisfaction is the goal for which Christ gives himself into death.

7 For the pun on Socinus see *SPT* 26.12, note 8. Faustus Socinus teaches that God can forgive our sins without requiring compensation or satisfaction. The purpose of the life and death

est, ad impulsivam referri debet. At talem expositionem Scriptura et communis loquendi usus non admittit.

XIII *Materia*, seu *pretium Satisfactionis* sunt omnes miseriae et cruciatus, quos Christus a prima statim nativitate, usque ad extremum illum muneris sacerdotalis actum,* passionis scilicet, sustinuit; praecipue vero mors crucis, exquisita illa, illique[a] cumulate sumpti, quos Esa. c. 53. dolores, aegritudinem, plagam, vulnera, livorem, quin et mortem appellat. *Vere*, inquit, *languores nostros ipse tulit, et dolores nostros bajulavit*, etc. 1 Petr. 2, 24. *Cujus livore seu vibicibus sanati estis*. Col. 1, 20. *Ut reconciliaret per eum omnia sibi, pace per sanguinem crucis facta*, et mox, *in corpore carnis per mortem*.

XIV Haec porro *mors* in sacris literis cum hisce qualitatibus,* et ut *saeva ac cruenta*, et ut *ignominiosa ac maledicta* proponitur. Utrumque supplicii, sanguinis et mortis crucis nomine* indicatur, Phil. 2. *Obedivit usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis*. Col. 1, 21. 22. Sigillatim quidem *mors violenta et cruenta*, voce* sanguinis explicatur, Act. 20, 28. *Deus acquisivit Ecclesiam suo sanguine*, Rom. 3, 25. *Quem proposuit placamentum in ipsius sanguine*. Eph. 2. 13. *Habemus redemptionem per sanguinem ipsius. Ignominiosa vero et maledicta*, quae voce contemtus, Esa. 53, 3. Ps. 22, 7. et crucis denotatur, quae jungitur cum ignominia, Hebr. 12, 2. et cum scandalo, Gal. 5, 11. et maledictione, Gal. 3, 13. *Maledictus omnis qui pendet in cruce*.

XV Veruntamen *perpessionum nomine*,* intelligendi non tantum dolores corporis, qui in cruciatibus, et morte corporea, sed quoque animae, Esa. 53. *Ubi laboraverit anima ejus*, iique longe gravissimi, non tantum ab illis ipsis exquisitis doloribus, aut metu mortis ob συμπάθειαν utriusque orti, aut quoque a causae* consideratione, quod ea pateretur justus pro injustis; sed immediate* a Deo in animam ejus effusi, videlicet ira Dei horribilis, propter peccata in se suscepta, in eum accensa et effusa, qua Deus ipsum severissime ultus est.

XVI Hos Propheta David Ps. 16, 10. et Actor. 2, 27. *dolores mortis* et *inferni* vocat, *Non derelinques animam meam in inferno*, et Symbolum Apostolicum, *descensu*

[a] cruciatusque: 1642.

of Christ is that we, humans, are enabled to perform the same obedience to God, and are thereby reconciled with God; the death of Christ is understood here as a 'final' cause, to be effectuated in our actual obedience. In several passages, Socinus states that the blood or the death of Christ is merely the 'occasion' on which God is appeased with mankind. Similarly, our sins are merely the 'occasion' on which Christ was handed over into death. See Faustus Socinus, *De Iesu Christo Servatore, Hoc est, cur et qua ratione Iesus Christus noster seruator sit* (Krakow: Alexander Rodecius, 1594), 62, 107–109, 291.

then it would have to be related to the impelling cause. But neither Scripture nor the common way of speaking permits such an explanation.

13 The matter, or the price, of the satisfaction are all the miseries and torments that Christ bore from the moment of his birth up until that last act* of his priestly office, that is, his passion. And it was especially that unique death which he suffered on the cross, and the collection of accumulated sufferings, which Isaiah 53 calls griefs, illness, beating, wounds, bruises, and even death. He says: "Indeed, he took our illnesses on himself and he carried our griefs, etc." 1 Peter 2:24: "You were cleansed by his bruises, or stripes." Colossians 1:20: "In order to reconcile all things to himself through him, by making peace through his blood on the cross;" and shortly thereafter: "In the body of flesh through death."

14 Moreover in the holy Scriptures this death, together with these qualities,* is presented as 'savage and bloody' as well as 'shameful and cursed.' And each of these is known by the words* 'punishment,' 'blood,' and 'death on the cross,' as in Philippians 2[:8]: "He was obedient unto death, even death on a cross." In Colossians 1:[20–]22 the violent and bloody death is conveyed by a single expression in the word* 'blood'; Acts 20:28: "God bought the Church with his blood;" Romans 3:25: "[God] presented him as an appeasement in his blood;" Ephesians [1:7 and] 2:13: "We have redemption through his blood." And as for 'shameful and accursed,' it is denoted by the word 'despised' (Isaiah 53:3; Psalm 22:7) and by 'the cross,' which occurs together with 'shame' (Hebrews 12:2) and with 'stumbling-block' (Galatians 5:11) and 'accursedness' (Galatians 3:13). For "cursed is everyone who hangs upon a cross."

15 Nevertheless, we should take the word* 'sufferings' to mean not only the bodily griefs (which arise from the torments and death in the body) but also the griefs of the soul,[8] as "when his soul suffered" (Isaiah 53[:11]). And these spiritual ones were by far most grievous, not just because they arose from the very special griefs themselves, or from the fear of death due to his suffering [both the physical and spiritual death], not even from a consideration of what their cause* was (since the just underwent those sufferings for the unjust). But they were most grievous because it was God who poured them out upon his soul; that is to say, it was the terrible wrath of God provoked over the sins committed against him that was kindled and poured out upon [Christ], and whereby God punished him most severely.

16 The prophet David (Psalm 16:10) and the Acts of the Apostles (2:27) call these spiritual griefs the "sorrows of death and hell": "You will not abandon my soul in hell;" and the Apostles' Creed summarizes them as "the descent into hell"—

8 For the spiritual sufferings of Christ see also *SPT* 27.6.

ad inferos, comprehendit. Non quod in specie* poenas infernales, ignis scilicet flammam, senserit; sed in genere, et aequipollentes, omniaque, quae cum iis conjuncta sunt, pertulerit.

XVII Evangelistae vero, animae affectionibus ac passionibus exprimunt, utpote dolore ac tristitia: *Tristis est anima mea usque ad mortem*, et ejus actibus λυπεῖσθαι, et ἀδημονεῖν, id est, *contristari et gravissime angi*, Matt. 26, 37. ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι, *expavescere*. Marc. 14, 33. adeo, ut tertio deprecatus sit poculum illud; imo in summo illo angore Angelica corroboratione opus habuerit, tantaque fuerit agonia, seu Christi luctantis angustia, ut ei praeter naturam* *sudorem sanguineum, instar grumorum descendentem in terram* expresserit, Luc. 22, 43. 44. Quod sane non dumtaxat de mortis terroribus (alioqui videri possent multi martyres Christo fortiores et constantiores) sed de terribili Dei Patris judicio et ira, quo nihil formidabilius cogitari potest, accipiendum est. Cujus extremus actus eo processit, ut se *derelictum a Patre exclamaverit*, Matt. 27, 46. In summa, *execratio factus est, ut essemus benedictio Dei in ipso*, Gal. 3, 13.

XVIII Neque tamen *desperare debuit*. Desperatio ita poena est, ut et peccatum sit. Filium autem Dei peccati vindicem, peccati exsortem esse oportuit. Omnia enim tulit quae sine peccato ferre potuit.*

XIX Neque enim *in aeternis quoad durationem poenis, morte* scilicet tum *corporali*, tum *spirituali, detineri* debuit, aut potuit.* Quia immensitatem quidem agonum et cruciatuum infernalium, cum desertione et abjectione a Deo, quod morti aeternae per se semper adest, sensit Christus a Deo desertus et abjectus ad inferos usque, alioqui id nobis sentiendum esset: at vero continuationem eorum, quod accidens est cum non fit liberatio, non item. Utrumque autem reprobi sentient.

not because Christ experienced the punishments of hell in particular* (i.e., the burning flames), but because he bore them in a general sense as punishments that were as powerful as those of hell itself, and everything that is bound up with them.[9]

17 And the gospel writers express it by the feelings and sufferings of the soul—as grief and sorrow: "My soul is sorrowful even unto death." And they express the activities of the soul as "being saddened and grievously anxious" (Matthew 26:37), "being deeply distressed" (Mark 14:33), so much so that three times Christ prayed that the cup be passed. Indeed, at that moment of his greatest anguish Christ needed strengthening from an angel, and while he struggled Christ's agony or distress was so great that he perspired beyond what was natural,* "letting sweat like drops of blood fall to the ground" (Luke 22:43–44). Obviously this should not only be taken as arising from a great fear of death (for if so, then many martyrs can appear to be stronger and more steadfast than Christ); no, this arises from the terrible judgment and wrath of God the Father, since one can think of nothing more fearful than this. The outworking of God's wrath reached to the point where "he called out that he had been forsaken by the Father" (Matthew 27:46). In short: "He became the curse, that in him we might be a blessing to God" (Galatians 3:13).

18 It was not necessary, however, that he should despair. For despair is a punishment of such a kind that it is also a sin. But in order to be the avenger of sin the Son of God had to be without sin. For he bore everything that he was able* to bear without sin.[10]

19 Nor was it necessary or possible* for him to be kept in eternal punishments—as far as its length of time was concerned—that is, in bodily as well as spiritual death. Because Christ did in fact experience the full extent of the hellish agonies and torments, along with God's abandonment and rejection of him (something that of itself always accompanies eternal death), having been forsaken and rejected by him even unto hell, which otherwise it would have been necessary for us to experience. But Christ did not experience them for an unbroken extent of time, which happens when there is no release.[11] On the other hand, those who have been condemned shall experience both of them.

---

9 An elaborate discussion of the 'descent into hell' is found in *SPT* 27.24–32.

10 In the time of the *Synopsis*, as in earlier eras, despair was seen as sin because it is the opposite of the Christian virtues of faith, hope, and love. If Christ had despaired, he would have distrusted God his Father, which conflicts with his perfect and constant obedience; see Van den Brink, *Tot zonde gemaakt*, 421–424.

11 The point here is that Thysius claims that Christ suffered eternal death, although he did not suffer death for an unbroken period of time. This means that God's abandonment and

XX Hujus autem causa,* quod peccatores condemnationis rei, iram Dei infinitam,* seu universam simul effusam, utpote nudi homines, tolerare non valuerint (alias enim creatura mox absorbenda et abolenda fuerat) sed tantum partiatim et certa mensura, prout ferre poterat creatura, inferenda erat, adeoque successive et cum continuatione perferri debuit. At vero Christus in una hypostasi* verus Deus et homo totaliter, et simul et semel, pro sua infinita potentia* et virtute, eam totam exantlavit. Ita ut aeternis revera poenis haec temporaria aequipolleat, Heb. 9, 14. Joh. 2, 19. et 10, 18. Act. 2, 24. 25. et 3, 15.

XXI Atque hae omnes peccatorum poenae, tam corporales, quam spirituales, peccatis in districto Dei judicio debitae, *peccati* nomine* veniunt. Unde dicitur *tulisse peccata nostra*, id est, poenas peccatorum, *factum esse peccatum*, id est, subditum poenae, et *execrationem*, id est, execrabilem, et poenae Legis obnoxium. Quin ipse Christus dicitur τιμὴ, *pretium, quo empti sumus*, 1 Cor. 6, 20. et 7, 23. λύτρον et ἀντίλυτρον, *pretium redemptionis*, Matt. 20, 28. 1 Tim. 2. 6. quod vicissim penditur, et adaequatum est. Quare et *pretioso sanguine redempti sumus*, utpote *agni immaculati et incontaminati, nempe Christi*, 1 Pet. 1, 18. 19. ita ut pretii hujus aequalitas a persona* et re ipsa dependeat.

XXII *Forma satisfactionis Christi*, est in modo* actuque,* scilicet in omni modo* perfectissima, pro omnibus nobis, id est, vice nostra, proque omnibus peccatis nostris, ad ea luenda et eluenda, Deo facta persolutione. Ut enim materia est in adaequata poena peccatis debita, in quibus consistit satisfactio, ita forma est: *Primo*, quod eas voluntati* Patris convenienter subierit, tulerit, toleraverit et exhauserit Filius Dei, Deus et homo, a cujus Deitate vis et potentia* est ad sustinendum. *Deinde* quod id praestiterit pro nobis, personam* et locum nostrum, ut noster sponsor, vas et praes tenens. *Denique Deo*, ut cui obligabamur, tamquam Deo, Creatori, Domino, Legislatori et Judici nostro, cui haec Satisfactio dependenda erat. In quibus plenaria Satisfactionis, qua talis, forma consistit.

XXIII Satisfactionis seu praestationis hujus *tres* sunt *actus*.* Ut enim sacrificium in atrio sacerdotum mactabatur et offerebatur, sanguis in sacrarium inferebatur coram Deo, populus in atrio ejus sanguine conspergebatur, Exod. 20. et 24., sic Christus, ut sacerdos in cruce, secundum eximium et extremum ejus actum,

---

rejection is essential to eternal punishment, and the everlasting character of the punishment is accidental, because a release from eternal death is possible. The fact that Jesus Christ suffered eternal death and was resurrected from the dead warrants the conclusion that eternal death is not essentially everlasting. For the fact that Christ did not suffer punishment for eternity and the underlying discussion with the Socinians see *SPT* 27.9, note 13. See also Van den Brink, *Tot zonde gemaakt*, 385–391.

And the reason* for this is the fact that the sinners who are guilty of the 20
damnation could not, being mere mortals, have had the strength to bear the infinite* wrath of God, nor could they bear all his wrath poured out at once in its fullness (for otherwise the created being would have been swallowed up and destroyed immediately). No, they would have had to bear it only partially and to a limited degree (to the extent that a created being would be able to bear it), and accordingly they would have to endure it successively and continuously. But Christ, in his single *hypostasis** of being entirely true God and man as befits his infinite power* and strength, at one and the same time endured [the wrath] completely. So much so that this suffering in time really was equivalent to eternal punishments (Hebrews 9:14; John 2:19 and 10:18; Acts 2:24, 25 and 3:15).

And all these bodily and spiritual punishments for sins, that in God's strict 21
judgment were owed for sins, also come by the name* of 'sin.' Hence it says that "He bore our sins," that is, the punishment for sins. "He was made to be sin," that is, he was a substitute for sin. And he was 'a curse,' that is, accursed and liable to the punishment of the Law. In fact, Christ himself is called *timē*, "the payment by which we have been bought" (1 Corinthians 6:20 and 7:23) and *lutron* and *antilutron*, the "ransom for redemption" (Matthew 20:28; 1 Timothy 2:6) that is paid as a substitute for something else and that has a value equal to it. Therefore also "we have been redeemed with his precious blood, namely a lamb without blemish or defect" (1 Peter 1:18–19), in such a way that the equivalence of the payment depends on the person* and on what is at stake.

The form of Christ's satisfaction is most perfect in mode* and act,* that is: 22
in every way,* by the full payment made to God for us all (i.e., in our place) and for all our sins, to purge them and wash them away. For as the matter of satisfaction rests on a punishment equivalent to what is owed for the sins (in which the satisfaction exists), so also its form. First, because the Son of God, in keeping with the will* of the Father, being both God and man whose power* and strength to bear the punishment came from his deity, has experienced, borne, suffered, and put a complete end to sins. Secondly, because it was on our behalf that he accomplished it, since it was as our guarantor, surety and bondsman that he assumed our person* and place. And lastly, because it was to God (since we were obliged to him) as our God, creator, Lord, lawgiver, and judge that this satisfaction had to be paid. It is in these things that the full form of the satisfaction as such exists.

There are three acts* in the satisfaction (or in the performance of satisfac- 23
tion) by Christ. For just as the priests' offering was slaughtered and presented in the fore-court, and its blood was carried into God's presence in the sanctuary, and the people in the fore-court were sprinkled by its blood (Exodus 20[:24] and 24[:8]), so too Christ, in his most excellent and final act, as Priest upon

pro nobis se obtulit; utque intercessor, Deo in sacrario coeli antea oblatum praesentavit, perpetuoque sacrificii sui vigore etiamnum facit; ut Rex, e coelo in terram nobis applicat, Hebr. 9, 12. et 13, 10. 11.

XXIV Ad hujus porro formae declarationem et probationem,* facit, quod in ἱλαστικοῖς, id est, propitiatoriis, seu expiatoriis sacrificiis, bestia sisteretur pro peccatore ipso, qui imposita ei manu peccata sua super ea confessus, illa quasi in eam transferebat, eaque pro eo mactabatur, et Deo offerebatur, Lev. 1, 4. et 16, 21., quae hostia et inde חטאת (*chatath*) *peccatum* et אשם (*asham*) *delictum*, non raro dicitur, id est, sacrificium piaculare, seu pro peccato, cui et peccatorum expiatio tribuitur, Num. 28, 22. Exod. 28. Quod typum et rationem habuit ad sacrificium illud Christi vere piaculare et propitiatorium.

XXV Quo respicit Propheta de Messia loquens, Esa. 53, 4. *Vere languores nostros ipse* נשא (*nasa*) *tulit*, et *dolores nostros* סבל (*sabal*) *bajulavit*, portavit, sustinuit; ubi posterior vox* generalitatem prioris, quae et pro auferre usurpatur, restringit. Sic vers. 11. *Notitia justi servi mei justificabit multos, et* (id est, nam) *iniquitates eorum ipse bajulavit*. Et sana עון (*avon*) *iniquitas*, quae non modo culpam, sed iniquitatis poenam notat, cum bajulandi voce juncta, Hebraeis est poenas ferre: quo sensu et accipiendum quod mox subjicitur, vers. 12. *et ipse* חאט (*chat*) *peccatum*, id est, supplicium peccati *multorum tulit*.

XXVI Eo facit quod est vers. 5. *Castigatio* (seu afflictio, quae mox labor dicitur) *pacificationum*, seu, *pacis nostrae, super eum*, id est, ei imposita est, et v. 6. תפגיע (*tiphgiang*)[a] *fecit occurrere in eum Dominus iniquitatem omnium nostrorum*, hoc est, impegit seu conjecit in eum poenam iniquitatum nostrarum. Graeci interpretes, παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν, emphatice, vers. 10. *Ponet delictum animam*, id est, sacrificium pro delicto. Quibus in locis, culpae imputatio, et poenae vicaria tolerantia et exantlatio significatur,* quodque nostram personam* tenuerit, et poenas nostras nostro loco subierit ac luerit.

XXVII Atque typi hujus Prophetiaeque luculentissima interpretatio in N. T. est. Eo respicit Joh. c. 1. v. 29. dum ait, *Ecce agnus Dei, ὁ αἴρων qui tollit*, scilicet in sese,

[a] Most probably a typographical error for "הפגיע (hiphgiang)."

the cross, offered himself on our behalf. And, as the Intermediary, he had previously presented himself as the offering in the heavenly sanctuary, and even now makes intercession through the everlasting power of his sacrifice. And as King from heaven he applies his satisfaction to us on earth (Hebrews 9:12, 13:10–11).

For further demonstration and proof* of the form of Christ's satisfaction it 24
is relevant to note that in the sacrifices of atonement or expiation the animal was put in the place of the one who had sinned, who by laying-on his hands and confessing his sins over it transferred (as it were) his sins onto it, and the animal was slain in his stead and offered to God (Leviticus 1:4; 16:21). And so the sacrificial animal was not rarely given the name *ḥata'at*, 'sin,' *'asham*, 'the misdeed'—i.e., the sacrificial offering or offering for sin, and to it was attributed also the atonement for the sins (Numbers 28:22; Exodus 28[12]). And so as a type it had a reasonable connection to that truly atoning and expiatory sacrifice of Christ.

It is with this in view that the prophet speaks about the Messiah, in Isaiah 25
53:4: "Truly, he took up (*nasa'*) our infirmities, and he carried (conveyed, or bore, *saval*)—our griefs." Here the latter word* is a restriction of the former's generalization, which is used also to mean "take away." And so verse 11: "Knowledge of my righteous servant will justify many, and (i.e., for) he himself carried their iniquities." And obviously "iniquity" (*'avon*) does not mean guilt but the punishment for iniquity, when the word "to carry" in Hebrew is juxtaposed with "to carry the punishments," and that is the sense in which we must understand what soon follows it: "And he himself bore the sin (*ḥet'*, i.e., the punishment for sin) of many."

Here it matters also what it says in verse 5: "The chastisement (or affliction, 26
which soon thereafter is called hardship) for peacemaking (or for our peace) was on him," i.e., was placed upon him. And verse 6: "The Lord caused to come upon (*hip'gia'*) him the iniquity of us all;" that is, He cast or turned onto him the punishment for our iniquities. The translators into Greek [the Septuagint] render it as "He handed him over to our sins." And it states emphatically in verse 10: "He will make his soul into a misdeed," that is, an offering for misdeed. In these places it means* the imputation of blame and the vicarious bearing and full endurance of punishment, and that he took the place of our person,* and in our place underwent and paid for our punishments.

And this type and its prophecy is most clearly explained in the New Testa- 27
ment. John has this in mind when he says: "Behold the Lamb of God who takes

12 The reference to Exodus 28 is unclear, possibly it should be Exodus 29, where *ḥata'at*, 'sin,' is used for the sacrificial offering in verses 14 and 36.

seu gestat, atque ita tollit, id est, aufert *peccatum mundi*. Unde et passim in Apoc. agnus appellatur, et agnus mactatus, Apoc. 13, 8. et 1Pet. 2, 24. *Christus peccata nostra* ἀνηνέγκε, (non dicit ἤνεγκε, quod tollere notat, Hebr. 9, 28.) *Sursum tulit in corpore suo super lignum*, scilicet crucis, utriusque et corporis et ligni ratione, mox enim, *ejus vibicibus sanati* dicimur. Ubi adjuncta perpessionis et liberationis nostrae mentio, poenae alienae susceptionem indicat.

XXVIII Quin illustres sunt illi loci, quibus *pro nobis*, id est, loco nostro haec omnia tolerasse pronunciatur, Matt. 20, 28. *Filius hominis venit ut ministraret, daretque animam suam in pretium* ἀντὶ, id est, *vice multorum*. Rom. 5, 6. 8. *Christus* ὑπὲρ, *super, pro impiis, et pro nobis mortuus est*, quod versus consequens evincit, 2 Cor. 5. *Eum qui non novit peccatum, pro nobis*, hoc est, in nostra persona,* *peccatum fecit*, tum imputando illi peccatorum nostrorum reatum, tum qua sacrificium factus est pro peccato, *ut nos efficeremur justitia Dei in ipso, id est, in persona ipsius*. Item Gal. 3, 13. *Christus nos redemit a maledictione legis, factus pro nobis κατάρα, execratio*, quod est interprete Apostolo ἐπικατάρατος, *execrabilis*, et ὑπὸ κατάρας, *execrationi obnoxius*, vers. 10. Quibus in locis ἀντὶ et ὑπέρ, pro nobis, nostra vice, loco et in persona nostra primo denotat. Unde et utilitas nostra consequitur.

XXIX *Finis** proinde Satisfactionis, *ᾧ cui*, seu *objectum*, sunt soli electi et vere fideles tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti. Etsi enim ea quoad magnitudinem, dignitatem et sufficientiam pretii in se* considerati, ad omnes homines sese extendere possit,* attamen ea singulariter depensa iis est, quos Pater elegit, Filioque dedit, quique ex Dei dono in Deum ejusque Filium crediturі. Unde Scriptura passim dicit, quod *pro suis, et nobis, pro ovibus, ecclesiaque* sese impenderit, Matt. 20, 28. et 26, 28. 1Job. 3, 16. Act. 20, 28. etc.

XXX *Finis** vero οὗ *cujus gratia*, seu usus rei,* qui in actu* positus effectus dici potest, respectu Dei quidem, seu *supremus*, est divinae justitiae et misericordiae ejus demonstratio. *Justitiae*, dum peccata nostra severissime punivit;

(i.e., takes upon himself, or bears, and so bears it that he removes it) the sin of the world" (John 1:29). Hence for this reason he is called 'lamb' everywhere in the book of Revelation, and also "the lamb that was slain" (Revelation 13:8 and 1 Peter 2:24). "Christ bore (*anēnegke*) our sins" (Hebrews 9:28)—it does not say *ēnegke*, which means 'to take away'—he bore our sins upon his body on the tree, i.e., the tree of the cross, in the sense of [bore] in his body and on the cross, for shortly thereafter it says that we have been cleansed by his wounds. There the joint mention of suffering and our deliverance implies the taking on of another's punishment.

28 In fact it is clear also in those places where he is declared to have borne all these things 'for us,' that is, 'in our place.' Matthew 20:28: "The Son of Man came to serve and to give his life as a ransom in the place of (*anti*) many." Romans 5:6,8: "Christ died above (*huper*), i.e., for the ungodly," and for us, as the following verse convincingly shows. 2 Corinthians 5[:21]: "He made him who knew no sin to be sin on our behalf," i.e., in our person,* by imputing to him the guilt of our sins, and because he was made an offering for sin that "we might become the righteousness of God in him," i.e., in his person. Similarly, Galatians 3:13: "Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, having been made the curse (*katara*) for us," which by the apostle's explanation (verse 10) means 'accursed' (*epikataratos*), and 'subject to the curse' (*hupo kataras*). In these places the words *anti* and *huper* mean primarily on our behalf, in our stead and place, and in our person. Hence comes also the usefulness of the satisfaction for us.

29 So then, the goal* of the satisfaction, for whose benefit it is (or who is its object), are only the elect and true believers of the Old and the New Testament. For although the satisfaction, as far as it concerns the magnitude, worth, and sufficiency of the payment (taken by itself*), could* be offered to all people, nevertheless it was given out only to those whom the Father has chosen and given to the Son, and who by God's free gift were going to believe in God and his Son.[13] Hence it says throughout Scripture that he gave himself 'for his own' and 'for us,' 'for the sheep,' and 'the Church' (Matthew 20:28; 26:28; 1 John 3:16; Acts 20:28).

30 And as for the goal* for the sake of which [the satisfaction was made], or the use of the matter,* which can be called its effect (when considered as an act*), and which—regarding God—even may be called the highest effect, is the proof of his divine justice and mercy. Of justice, because he punished our

13 For the distinction between the sufficiency of Christ's sacrifice for all people and its efficacy for the elect or the true believers see also *Canons of Dort*, II, 3–6 and II, rejection of errors 3.

misericordiae, dum non in nobis, in quibus merito potuit,* sed in alio, Filio scilicet suo proprio, Rom. 3, 25. 26. *Quem Deus constituit placamentum per fidem in sanguine ipsius, ad ostensionem justitiae suae; per praetermissionem praecedentium peccatorum ex Dei tolerantia, ad ostensionem justitiae suae praesenti tempore, ut sit ipse justus et justificans eum qui sit ex fide Jesu.* Ubi justitiae et justi vocabulis intelligitur communiter, tum qua Deus vindex et ultor peccatorum, ut vox placaminis et justificationis arguunt; tum qua clemens, verax et fidelis, ut quem constituit placamentum in sanguine ipsius. Ita hic simul severitas punientis, et gratia bonitasque servantis comprehenditur.

XXXI Respectu Christi vero, seu *finis** *intermedius est*, patefactio caritatis ejus summae, ut qui pro inimicis suis mortuus est, Rom. 5, 6.

XXXII Quoad nos denique, et *finis** *infimus seu proximus*,* est nostri pacificatio et sanitas, Es. 53, 5. *Castigatio pacificationum nostrarum super eum, et livore ejus medicatum est nobis.* Item justificatio, *In scientia sui justificabit justus servus meus multos*, etc. Qui finis disertius in N. Test. explicatur, utpote ἄφεσις, *remissio peccatorum*, Matt. 26, 28. ἀθέτησις, *abolitio et sublatio peccati*, Hebr. 9, 26. 28. πάρεσις, *transmissio et laxatio*, Rom. 3. Justificatio et servatio ab ira, Rom. 5, 9. Justitia Dei, 2 Cor. 5, 21. Benedictio, Gal. 3, 13. Redemptio in actu ac[a] salvatio, Eph. 1, 7. Col. 1, 14. Reconciliatio cum Deo, Col. 1, 20. Eph. 2. Quae omnia liberationem a poena, seu impunitatem declarant.

XXXIII Quin et *justitia et sanctitas inhaerens* comprehenditur, praesertim iis locis, in quibus communioribus vocibus* Scriptura utitur, ut dum Christus ejusque sanguis, scilicet effusus, nos purgare, 1 Pet. 1, 2. mundare, 1 Joh. 1, 7. lavare, Apoc.

[a] seu: 1642.

sins most severely; of mercy, because he did not punish them in us (in whom he could* deservedly have done so) but in another, namely his very own Son (Romans 3:25–26): "God presented him as an atoning sacrifice through faith in his blood, to demonstrate his justice; [God did so] out of forbearance by leaving unpunished the sins committed beforehand, in order to display his justice in the present time, so that he Himself might be just and the justifier of the one who has faith in Jesus." Here the words 'justice' and 'just' are taken closely together, since hereby God is the avenger and the punisher of sins, as the words 'appeasement' and 'justification' clearly show; and he is also merciful, truthful, and faithful, as the phrase "appeasement through his blood" declares. And so here the severity of the one who punishes and the grace and goodness of the one who saves are united.

However, with respect to Christ or the 'intermediate goal,'* it is the revelation 31
of his great love, as he was the one who died for his enemies (Romans 5:6).

And lastly, insofar as it concerns us and the lowest or 'proximate* goal,'* it is 32
to provide peace and wellbeing to us, as in Isaiah 53:5: "The chastisement for our peace was on him, and his wounds are healing for us." So too for justification: "Through the knowledge of him my just servant will justify many [Isaiah 53:11]," etc. This goal is explained more fully in the New Testament, with the words "remission (*aphesis*) of sins" (Matthew 26:28), the "doing away with, or taking away of, sin" (*athetēsis*, Hebrews 9:26, 28), the "loosening or transference" [of sin] (Romans 3[:25]). It is the justification and preservation from wrath (Romans 5:9), God's justice (2 Corinthians 5:21), his blessing (Galatians 3:13[and 14]), realized redemption and so salvation[14] (Ephesians 1:7; Colossians 1:14), the reconciliation with God (Colossians 1:20, Ephesians 2). All these clearly show the deliverance or freedom from punishment.

Moreover, this goal contains also the righteousness and holiness that goes 33
with it, especially in those places where Scripture uses those words* more common; as when Christ and his blood (i.e., his blood poured out) purges

14 The insertion of *in actu* with the two terms 'redemption' and 'salvation' can be explained in two ways. First, it may have rhetorical force in the enumeration of the effects of satisfaction for us. After the different partial aspects derived from a number of biblical places, Thysius arrives at the more comprehensive terms 'redemption' and 'salvation,' and he underscores these terms by the words *in actu*. Second, a stronger and logical interpretation takes *in actu* as the opposite of *in potentia*. The background of this opposition is the view, advocated for example by the Remonstrants, that redemption and salvation are merely opened as a possibility by Christ's suffering and death, while the actual realization of salvation requires the assent of man's free choice. In this connection, Thysius subtly points to the actual rather than merely possible status of the redemption and salvation effected by Christ's satisfaction.

1, 5. a peccatis dicitur; quibus primo et primario liberatio a poena, inde et emendatio et sanctificatio animi significatur.* Imo distincte utrumque conjungitur, Tit. 2, 14. *Qui dedit semetipsum pro nobis ut redimeret nos ab omni iniquitate, et purificavit sibi ipsi populum peculiarem, studiosum bonorum operum*.

XXXIV Atque haec de satisfactionis causis;* ex quarum consideratione apparet et ejus *necessitas*,* eaque duplex: tum *absoluta*,* quoad Dei naturam,* qua non modo peccatum, ut sibi adversum, summe odit et execratur, sed et severissime punit, unde et sine satisfactione esse non potuit* culpae et poenae remissio; tum *hypothetica*, qua, ut decrevit morte punire peccatorem, secundum illud, *Morte morieris*, ita et decrevit sic et hoc modo,* per mortem scilicet Filii sui sibi satisfieri, et quidem huic atque illi illam impendi voluit; qui modus* decreti divini est, et quidem eximie secundum sapientiae et justitiae suae rationem agentis. Ita ut Deus hic egerit non modo ut *Rector* sed et ut omnium *justissimus Judex*, Gen. 18, 25. Rom. 1, 32. et 3, 5. 6. 2 Thess. 1, 5. 6.

XXXV Ceterum de Satisfactione quidem hic egimus, qua est in *poenae pro peccatis persolutione*; at vero more Scripturae, propter συγγένειαν, cognationem, et necessariam cohaesionem, sub ea comprehendimus et *alteram ejus partem*; qua Christus sanctitatem et justitiam, quae in nobis requirebatur, et ad quam praestandam tenebamur, pro nobis et habuit, et toto vitae curriculo praestitit, ut in ipso Legi Dei per omnia essemus conformes, ac jus vitae aeternae nobis acquireret; quod totalis et debiti secundum Legem ratio, et obedientia justitia-

(1 Peter 1:2), cleanses (1 John 1:7), and washes us from sins (Revelation 1:5). These expressions signify* chiefly and primarily the deliverance from sin, and then also the amendment and sanctification of the soul. In fact, the two separate notions are joined together in Titus 2:14: "He gave himself for us in order to redeem us from all iniquity, and he purified for himself a special people, zealous for good works."

So much, then, for the causes* of Christ's satisfaction. The consideration of 34
the causes also makes clear the necessity* of his work of satisfaction, and it is two-fold. In one sense it is absolute,* as far as it concerns God's nature,* whereby he greatly detests and hates sin (as it is contrary to him), but also punishes it most severely—for which reason there could* be no forgiveness of guilt and punishment without satisfaction. Yet in another sense the necessity is hypothetical, because as he had decreed to punish the sinner with death, according to the statement "by death you shall die," so he had also decreed that in the very same way* satisfaction would be made to him through the death of his own Son, and it was his will that the satisfaction would be granted to this person and that one.[15] This was the manner* of the divine decree, and in fact it was in an exceptional accordance with the wisdom and justice of the one who so acted. In this way it was such that God conducted himself not only as Ruler but also as the most just Judge of all people (Genesis 18:25; Romans 1:32 and 3:5–6; 2 Thessalonians 1:5–6).

Whereas we have given a treatment here of satisfaction insofar as it consists 35
of the full payment made for the penalty of sins, we also include a second part of it—as is the way of Scripture, in fact—because of the relationship which necessarily accompanies it. For by [that part] Christ both possessed and accomplished, throughout the course of his entire life, the holiness and righteousness that we were required and bound to accomplish, so that in him we might be conformed to the Law of God in everything; and so that he might obtain for us the right to life eternal.[16] For that is demanded by the

15 Thysius uses the distinction between absolute and hypothetical necessity. Satisfaction involves both. God's hatred of sin belongs to his nature and therefore the necessity of satisfaction for sin is absolute. Because of God's nature, forgiveness of sins is not possible without satisfaction. But there is also a hypothetical necessity involved in satisfaction. The necessary satisfaction by the death of God's own Son does not pertain to the essence or nature of God; it is consequent to God's free will and his decree to punish the sinner by death. The necessity of salvation as such is therefore also hypothetical.

16 In early Reformed theology, a discussion arose concerning the distinction between the 'passive' and the 'active' obedience of Christ as grounds for our justification. Most Reformed theologians held that both the suffering and death of Christ (*oboedientia passiva*) and his perfect and holy life (*oboedientia activa*) constitute the righteousness that

que Christi, et fides quae totum Christum prehendit, exigit, Gen. 15, 6. Esa. 53, 9. Jer. 23, 5. 6. et 33, 16. Dan. 9, 24. Luc. 1, 35. Matt. 3, 15. Joh. 17, 19. Rom. 3, 22. et 5, 18. 19. 21. et 8, 3. 4. et 10, 3. 4. 1 Cor. 1, 30. Gal. 3, 14. 18. et 4, 4. 5. Phil. 2, 8. et 3, 8. 9. Hebr. 10, 7. 10. Ceterum haec sanctitas et justitia respicit quoque sacerdotale munus. Debuit enim et sacerdos legaliter esse sanctus et justus, et ipsa hostia integra et immaculata.

XXXVI Quamvis autem Satisfactio haec Christi praestita sit pro nobis, nostra scilicet vice et utilitate, tamen, ut nostra sit, *opus est insuper fide*. Unde Scriptura traditionem et sanguinem Filii cum fide copulat, Joh. 3. *Ita dilexit Deus mundum, ut dederit Filium, ut quicunque credit in illum, non pereat, sed habeat vitam aeternam*. Rom. 3. *Quem proposuit Deus, ut esset placamentum per fidem in sanguine ejus*.

ANTITHESES I.

Rejicimus itaque *primo*, impiam illam sententiam, quae impossibilem, adeoque *nullam satisfactionem*, seu eam Deo nec potuisse,* nec debuisse fieri, statuit: Quin Christi passiones et mortem tantum esse *martyrium*; item *confirmationem et obsignationem* liberalitatis Dei de remittendis peccatis; et *exemplum*, quo sanctissima et innocentissima vita et morte viam salutis aperuerit, atque ita credentibus, id est, obedientibus, remissionem peccatorum impetrarit.

Ant. II *Deinde* illam injuriam quoque in Christi personam* et meritum, quae *acceptilationem*, aut semiplenam, quae tamen id efficiat quod plena, pro satisfactione supponit.

Ant. III *Denique* et eam, veritati tamen proximam,* quae necessitatem* ejus facit hypotheticam tantum, seu pendentem dumtaxat ex decreto Dei, non etiam

---

is imputed to the believers. Johannes Piscator (1546–1625) defended the position that the 'active' obedience of Christ does indirectly contribute to the salvific value of his 'passive' obedience, but he denied that it is in a direct way imputed as righteousness to the believers. Cf. the confessional statement in the *Belgic Confession*, art. 22: "Jesus Christ is our righteousness in making available to us all his merits and all the holy works he has done for us and in our place." For a brief survey of the debate see Alister E. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 272–275.

entire account of the one indebted according to the Law, and also by Christ's obedience and righteousness, and by the faith that takes hold of the whole Christ (Genesis 15:6; Isaiah 53:9; Jeremiah 23:5–6 and 33:16; Daniel 9:24; Luke 1:35; Matthew 3:15; John 17:19; Romans 3:22 and 5:18, 19, and 21; Romans 8:3–4 and 10:3–4; 1 Corinthians 1:30; Galatians 3:14, 18, and 4:4–5; Philippians 2:8 and 3:8–9; Hebrews 10:7 and 10). And this holiness and righteousness concern also Christ's office as priest. For according to the Law the priest had to be holy and just, and the sacrificial animal had to be whole and without blemish.

Moreover, although Christ presented this satisfaction for us (i.e., on our behalf and for our benefit), nevertheless, for it to be ours, faith is required in addition to it. Hence Scripture links God's giving up of the Son and his blood with faith. John 3[:16]: "For God so loved the world that he gave his Son, that whoever believes in him should not perish but have eternal life." Romans 3[:25]: "God presented him as an atoning sacrifice through faith in his blood."[17] 36

Antitheses

And so we reject in the first place the godless notion which holds that satisfaction is impossible to the point that there could* not have been (nor ought there to have been) any satisfaction to God. It holds that Christ's sufferings and death are only deeds of martyrdom, a confirmation and seal of God's liberality in forgiving sins, and an example whereby Christ opened the way to salvation with his most holy and blameless life and death, and thus obtained the remission of sins for those who believe (i.e., those who obey). Ant. 1

In the second place we reject that injustice done to the person* and merit of Christ, which replaces Christ's satisfaction with an 'acceptilation,'[18] or with a partial satisfaction as efficient as the complete one. Ant. 2

And lastly we also reject the following position (though it is very close* to the truth), which turns the necessity* of the satisfaction into a hypothetical Ant. 3

17 The connection stated here between the satisfaction presented by Christ and the faith in which we receive this satisfaction anticipates the following disputations 30, 31, and 33 on faith and justification.

18 Thysius refers back to thesis 2 where the term *acceptilatio* also occurs. See also note 2 above. The position that Christ's sacrifice was not a 'full payment,' but was still accepted by God on account of his free will, was advocated by several nominalist theologians during the first quarter of the sixteenth century. During the Remonstrant controversies, the views of Jacob Arminius and Peter Bertius seemed to appropriate the notion—advocated by Faustus Socinus—of 'acceptilation' as 'partial solution'. Around the time of the *Synopsis*, Hugo Grotius gave his own nuanced and innovative interpretation of the imputation of Christ's righteousness, though without endorsing the term *acceptilatio*. Cf. Strehle, *Catholic Roots*, 91–101, and see also Van den Brink, *Tot zonde gemaakt*, 120–121.

absolutam,* dependentem similiter ex divina natura* justitiaque Dei naturali.*

Origines, *Hom. 3. in Levitic.*[a]

Si quis bene meminit eorum quae dicta sunt, poterit nobis dicere, quia sacrificium, quod Pontificem pro peccato diximus obtulisse, figuram Christi tenere posuimus, et conveniens non videtur vero Christo, qui peccatum nescit, ut pro peccato dicatur obtulisse sacrificium, licet per mysterium res agatur, et idem ipse Pontifex, idem ponatur et hostia. Vide ergo si et ad hoc possumus hoc modo occurrere: quia Christus peccatum quidem non fecit, peccatum tamen pro nobis factus est, dum qui erat in forma Dei, in forma servi esse dignatur, dum qui immortalis est, moritur, et impassibilis patitur, et invisibilis videtur; et quia nobis hominibus vel mors, vel reliqua omnis fragilitas in carne ex peccati conditione superducta est, ipse etiam qui in similitudine hominum factus est, et habitu compertus ut homo, sine dubio pro peccato quod ex nobis susceperat, quia peccata nostra portavit, vitulum immaculatum, hoc est, carnem incontaminatam obtulit hostiam Deo.

[a] Origen, *In Leviticum homiliae* 3.1 (SC 286:120–122).

one only, namely making it only dependent on God's decree, and not also an absolute* necessity similarly dependent on the divine nature* and the essential* justice of God.[19]

Origen, *Sermon 3 on Leviticus*

If one recalls accurately what we've stated, he could well tell us that our position is that the sacrifice we said was offered by the priest for sin contained a figure of Christ, but that this does not match the true Christ (for he knew no sin), namely that he is said to have brought the offering for sin—granted that is was done through a mystery and that the one who is the priest is at the same time also the sacrificial offering. Consider then, whether we can agree on this point as follows. Christ indeed committed no sin, yet he was made to be sin for us, because he who was in the form of God deigned to take on the form of a servant; because he who is immortal actually dies, because he who cannot suffer actually suffers, and because he who cannot be seen is in fact seen. And also since for us mortals death and all the other weaknesses of the flesh were brought on because of our sinful state, so too he himself was made into the likeness of man, and in appearance became known as a man, then it is without a doubt that he, for the sin which he had taken upon himself from us (because he carried our sins), presented to God a calf without spot, that is, his own undefiled flesh, as an offering.

19 Thysius points out that the 'hypothetical' necessity of satisfaction (cf. thesis 34 above) can be understood in two ways. In the first sense, hypothetical necessity (or necessity of the consequence) is the only sort of necessity which is accepted. God wills satisfaction, and in connection with God's will this satisfaction occurs necessarily, but this act of God's will itself is not connected with God's justice in the sense that it is an essential property of God. The second option implied by antithesis 3 is that the hypothetical necessity of satisfaction is based on God's essential righteousness. Hypothetical and absolute necessity are intimately linked so that there is no isolated hypothetical necessity. Latent in these options is an interesting development in early Reformed theology. Calvin had taught that the necessity of the satisfaction was not simple and absolute, but "flowed from the heavenly decree" (*Institutes* 2.12.1), and he was followed by Beza, Musculus and Zanchi, among others. Beza later changed his mind and, under his influence, the view became dominant in the seventeenth century that the necessity of Christ's satisfaction is absolute. Thysius joins this line of thinking. He rejects the idea that Christ's satisfaction only depends on a decision of God. It also rests on God's nature and his essential justice; see thesis 34 above.

Idem, *Hom. 24. in Numer*.[a]

Donec sunt peccata, necesse est requiri hostias pro peccatis. Nam pone, (*verbi gratia*) *non fuisse peccatum: si non fuisset peccatum, non necesse fuerat Filium Dei agnum fieri, nec opus fuerat eum in carne positum jugulari; sed mansisset hoc quod in principio erat Deus verbum. Verum quoniam introiit peccatum in hunc mundum, peccati autem necessitas* propitiationem requirit, et propitiatio non fit nisi per hostiam, necessarium fuit provideri hostiam pro peccato.*

Ambrosius, *De Josepho*, cap. 4.[b]

Venditus est Joseph in Aegypto, quia Christus venturus ad eos quibus dictum erat: Peccatis vestris venditi estis. Et ideo suo sanguine redemit quos propria peccata vendiderant. Sed venditus Christus conditionis susceptione, non culpae; peccatique pretio non tenetur, quia peccatum ipse non fecit. Pretio igitur nostro debitum non suo aere contraxit: chirographum sustulit, feneratorem removit, exuit debitorem. Unus exsolvit, quod ab omnibus debebatur. Non licebat nobis exire servitio. Suscepit hoc ille pro nobis, ut servitutem mundi repelleret, libertatem Paradisi restitueret, gratiam novam consortii sui honore donaret.*

Augustinus, *De Trinitate*, lib. 13. cap. 10–15.[c]

Sanandae nostrae miseriae convenientior modus alius non fuit, nec esse oportuit. Quid enim tam necessarium fuit ad erigendam spem nostram, mentesque mortalium conditione ipsius mortalitatis abjectas, ab immortalitatis desperatione liberandas, quam ut demonstraretur nobis quanti nos penderet Deus, quantumque diligeret, etc. Quae est igitur justitia, qua victus est Diabolus? quae nisi justitia Jesu Christi, et quomodo victus est? quam[d] *cum in eo nihil dignum morte inveniret, occidit tamen, in hac redemptione, tamquam pretium pro nobis datus est sanguis Christi, quo accepto, Diabolus non ditatus est, sed ligatus est, ut nos ab ejus nexibus solveremur, etc.*

---

[a] Origen, *In Numeros homiliae* 24.1,6 (SC 461:160–162). [b] Ambrose, *De Ioseph, IV* (CSEL 32/2:85–86). [c] Augustine, *De trinitate* 13.10,13 (CCSL 50A:399–400). [d] quia: Augustine, *De trinitate*.

Origen, *Sermon 24 on Numbers*

For as long as sins exist, sacrifices for sins are necessarily required. For suppose (for the sake of the argument) that sin did not exist. If sin did not exist, it would not have been necessary for the Son of God to become the lamb, nor would there have been need for him to be slain when he was in the flesh, but he would have remained what he was in the beginning: God the Word. But since "sin entered into this world" [Romans 5:12], and the necessity* of sin demands atonement, and atonement is not possible without a sacrifice, it was necessary that a sacrifice for sin be provided.

Ambrose, *On Joseph the Patriarch*, chapter 4

Joseph was sold in Egypt, because Christ was going to come to those who had been told: "You were sold on account of your sins." And accordingly it was by his own blood that he redeemed those whose own sins had sold them. But Christ was sold because he took their condition upon himself, and not because of guilt. And he is not detained by the payment for sin, because he himself did not commit sin. Therefore he assumed the debt in order to pay for us and not for anything that he owed: he took over the promissory note, he removed the lender, and he set the debtor aside. It was one person who discharged the debt that all people owed. It was not lawful for us to escape slavery. It was he who undertook it for our sake, in order to drive out the slavery to the world, to restore the freedom of Paradise and to bestow new grace* through the honor of his fellowship.

Augustine, *On the Trinity*, book 13 chapters 10–15

There was no other, more suitable way to cleanse us of our wretchedness, nor was there a need to find one. For what was so necessary for raising our hopes and to set the minds of mortals, cast down by their mortality, free from despairing of immortality, than that we be shown how much God valued us and how much he loved us, etc. What, then, was the righteousness whereby the devil was conquered? What, except the righteousness of Christ? And in what way was he conquered? Because when [God] found in him nothing deserving death and nevertheless slew him, by this work of redemption the blood of Christ was given as a payment for us, and, as it was accepted, the devil was not enriched by it, but bound up, so that we might be loosed from his chains, etc.

DISPUTATIO XXX

De Hominum Vocatione ad Salutem

Praeside D. JOHANNE POLYANDRO
Respondente HENRICO GELDORPIO

THESIS I Electionis ad salutem, de qua supra actum fuit, exsecutio, certis constat gradibus ac mediis, per quae Deus suos electos gratia* sua salutari in hoc seculo, ac gloria sua sempiterna, in altero beare constituit.

II Haec specialis hominum ad Redemptorem mundi Jesum Christum Vocatio, ab universali ipsorum ad Deum Creatorem suum vocatione, distinguenda est.

III Universalis vocatio est, qua omnes ac singuli homines per communia naturae documenta ad Deum Creatorem suum cognoscendum ac colendum invitantur, Act. 17, 27. Rom. 1, 20. Quae propterea vocatio naturalis* nuncupari potest.

IV Communia illa naturae* documenta, sunt partim interna, atque omnium hominum cordibus inscripta, partim externa, rebusque a Deo creatis insculpta; quorum illa Legis, Rom. 2, 14. haec sermonum gloriam Dei annuntiantium titulo insigniuntur, Ps. 19, 4.

V Vocatio specialis est, qua Deus aliquos ex universo genere humano ad supernaturalem* Jesu Christi Redemptoris nostri cognitionem ac salutarem benefi-

DISPUTATION 30

On the Calling of People to Salvation

President: Johannes Polyander
Respondent: Henricus Geldorpius[1]

The election unto salvation (which was treated above) is carried out through certain steps and means whereby God has determined that those whom He has chosen for himself should be blessed with his saving grace* in this age and with his eternal glory in the age that is to come.[2] 1

We should make a distinction between this special calling of men to Jesus Christ the Redeemer of the world and the universal calling of them to God its Creator. 2

By the universal calling each and every human being is summoned, by means of patterns occurring generally in the natural* world, that he should know and worship God the Creator (Acts 17:27; Romans 1:20). For this reason it may be named 'the natural* calling.' 3

As for the generally occurring patterns of nature,* they are partly internal—recorded on the hearts of all people—and partly external, engraved by God in the created things. The former kind is known by the name 'Law' (Romans 2:14), the latter by 'words that declare the glory of God' (Psalm 19:4). 4

By the special calling God calls some people out of the whole human race to a supernatural* knowledge of Jesus Christ our Redeemer, to share in his life- 5

---

1 Henricus Geldorp was born in Sneek in 1600, and studied theology at the university of Franeker where he matriculated on 25 October 1619; see Theodorus Josephus Meijer and Sybrandus Johannes Fockema Andreae, *Album studiosorum academiae franekerensis (1585–1811, 1816–1844)* (Franeker: Wever, 1968), 63. Prior to his ordination, Geldorp spent some time at the University of Leiden, where he defended this disputation, yet without an official matriculation; his name does not appear in Du Rieu's *Album studiosorum*. Geldorp served as minister in Oostzaan (1625), Leeuwarden (1626), and Amsterdam (1628) until his death on 6 October 1652. See Van Lieburg, *Repertorium*, 72. Cf. Jan Pieter de Bie en Jakob Loosjes, *Biographisch woordenboek van protestantsche godgeleerden in Nederland* (The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1919–1931), 3:203.

2 For the distinction between the eternal decree of election and its execution in time see *SPT* 24.10–11. In the Leiden cycles of disputations prior to the Synod of Dort the call always follows immediately after predestination and is defined as the execution of predestination. In the disputations after the synod the two subjects are separated and the call is defined as the execution of election. For a detailed comparison of the Leiden disputations on this subject see Van den Belt, "*Vocatio* in the Leiden Disputations," 539–559.

ciorum ipsius participationem per ministerium Evangelii ac vim Spiritus Sancti ex hujus mundi inquinamentis evocat; ideoque vocatio supernaturalis atque Evangelica appellari potest.

VI Priore vocatione Dei cognitio potius theoretica, quam practica; posteriore, cognitio Dei tam practica quam theoretica, atque adeo fides justificans quorundam vocatorum animis ingeneratur.

VII Hinc sapientes hujus seculi adminiculo prioris Vocationis ad Deum quasi palpando inveniendum invitati, veritatem mente conceptam cordis sui pervicacia in injustitia detinent, Rom. 1, 18. Filii vero lucis posteriori vocationi obtemperantes ad sortem Sanctorum in luce participandam, sapientes redduntur ad salutem per fidem in Jesum Christum, Col. 1, 12. 13. 2 Tim. 3, 15.

VIII Quocirca, sicuti fides justificans est unicum sortis sanctorum in luce participandae instrumentum; sic vocatio Evangelica est primus ad fidem aditus.

IX Errant igitur qui non tantum Evangelicam, sed naturalem* quoque vocationem salutis vestibulum faciunt, cum nonnulli quidem Evangelicae, nulli autem naturalis vocationis beneficio ad cognitionem Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi (quae sola est ad vitam aeternam via) perveniant, Joh. 14, 6. et 17, 3.

X Vocationis Evangelicae causa* efficiens principalis est Deus Pater, in Filio, per Spiritum Sanctum, 1 Thess. 2, 12. Eph. 1, 17. et 4, 11. 12. Apoc. 3, 20.

XI Filius enim, ut Mediator Dei et hominum, ac caput Ecclesiae, hos per Spiritum Sanctum et Verbum veritatis ad se vocat, Matt. 11, 28. Spiritus Sanctus verbi* praecones donis instruit necessariis ad eos, ad quos a Patre in nomine Filii mittuntur, sua invitatione in Christo communionem attrahendos, 1 Cor. 12, 4. Heb. 2, 4.

giving benefits, and [to a departure] from the corruptions of this world; and God does so through the ministry of the Gospel and the power of the Holy Spirit. Therefore this calling may also go by the name of supernatural and the Gospel-call.

6 The knowledge of God that comes by the first calling is theoretical rather than practical. By the latter calling the knowledge of God is practical as well as theoretical, and in that way justifying faith is ingenerated in the hearts of certain people who have been called.[3]

7 Hence those of this world who are wise, even though they have been summoned to search for God by fumbling about for him (so to speak) with the aid of the first kind of calling, in their stubbornness of heart they in unrighteousness suppress the truth that their minds had received (Romans 1:18). But the sons of light, heeding the second kind of calling "to partake of the lot of the saints who are of the light," "are rendered wise unto salvation through faith in Jesus Christ" (Colossians 1:12–13; 2 Timothy 3:15).

8 Therefore, just as justifying faith is the only instrument to partake in the lot of the saints in the light, so the Gospel-call is the first avenue to faith.

9 And so those people err who make not only the Gospel-call but also the natural* calling into an entrance-way to salvation.[4] By the aid of the Gospel-call some people come to a knowledge of our Savior Jesus Christ (which is the only way to eternal life); but no-one comes to it with the aid of the natural calling (John 14:6 and 17:3).

10 The primary efficient cause* of the Gospel-call is God the Father, in the Son and through the Holy Spirit (1 Thessalonians 2:12; Ephesians 1:17 and 4:11–12; Revelation 3:20).

11 For the Son, as the Mediator between God and men, and as Head of the Church, calls these people to himself through the Holy Spirit and the Word of truth (Matthew 11:28). The Holy Spirit equips the preachers of the Word* with gifts that are needed to draw those people—to whom the Father sends them in the name of the Son—into communion with Christ by His summons (1 Corinthians 12:4; Hebrews 2:4).

---

3 The distinction of theoretical and practical also occurs in *SPT* 13.33 where theoretical refers to the process of the intellect distinguishing true from false, and practical to the process of the intellect distinguishing good from evil. For other uses of the distinction see *SPT* 1.22, 14.22–23, 51.42.

4 There is no preparation for salvation that precedes the Gospel-call. The Synod of Dort denied that the light of nature leads to a saving knowledge of God and rejected the opinion that natural man can make such use the light of nature that he is able thereby gradually to obtain salvation. *Canons of Dort* III/IV, 4–6 and rejection of the errors 5.

XII Causa* προηγουμένη, qua Deus ex se intrinsecus movetur, est ipsius gratia atque εὐδοκία seu propensa voluntas* ad suam salutem miseris peccatoribus in Christo offerendam.

XIII Hujus socia fuit consultrix et provida Dei sapientia, qua Deus nonnullorum ex universa hominum peccatorum multitudine vocationem salutarem sic disposuit, ut suam erga illos misericordiam absque ullo, aut justitiae, aut libertatis suae praejudicio demonstrare posset.*

XIV Causa* προκαταρκτικὴ, seu impellens externa, est expiatoria Jesu Christi pro vocandorum peccatis oblatio.

XV Causa* instrumentalis ordinaria est verbi divini per Evangelii praecones administratio, 2 Thess. 2, 14. De extraordinaria certi nihil ex Scriptura statui potest.

XVI Materia circa quam, seu objectum vocationis, est genus* humanum ob peccatum morti aeternae obnoxium, non universaliter, sed communiter* ac distributive sumptum, Matt. 9, 13.

XVII Proinde si communis* hominum natura* corrupta spectetur, omnes sunt pariter Dei vocatione ad salutem indigni, et ad respondendum inepti, ut qui pariter mortui sunt in peccatis, et filii irae, a vita Dei abalienati, ipsiusque inimici, Eph. 2, 1. 3. et 4, 18. Col. 1, 21. tametsi alii minus, alii magis, suam pravitatem extrinsecus patefaciant.

XVIII Qui e contrario aliquam humanae naturae* corruptae aptitudinem ad respondendum Deo vocanti attribuunt, ii, quae sunt distinguenda, confundunt, aptitudinis scilicet subjectum* et aptitudinis modum.* Illius respectu homo

The impelling cause*,[5] whereby God is moved internally by Himself, is God's grace, his good pleasure and favorably-inclined will* to offer, in Christ, his salvation to wretched sinners. 12

God's thoughtful, provident wisdom accompanied his grace, and with it God ordered the saving call of some people from the host of sinful people worldwide in such a way that he could* display to them his own mercy, without disadvantaging his own justice or freedom. 13

The initiating cause*,[6] or the external compelling one, is Christ's atoning sacrifice for the sins of those people whom God will call. 14

The ordinary instrumental cause* is the ministry of the divine Word through the preachers of the Gospel (2 Thessalonians 2:14). And as far as an extraordinary instrumental cause is concerned, nothing certain can be determined about it from Scripture.[7] 15

And as for the subject-matter of which the calling is concerned, or the object of the calling, it is the human race* that deserves everlasting death on account of sin; in this instance 'human race' is used not in a universal sense, but in a general* and distributive sense (Matthew 9:13).[8] 16

Accordingly, when we look to the corrupt nature* that people have in common,* they are all equally unworthy to be called by God to salvation and unsuited for responding [to him]; they are all equally dead in sins and children of wrath, alienated from the life to God and hostile to him (Ephesians 2:1–3, and 4:18; Colossians 1:21)—although outwardly some expose their own depravity less than others. 17

Those who in contradiction ascribe to corrupt human nature* some aptitude for responding to God and his calling, confuse things that must be kept apart, namely the human subject* of the aptitude and the mode* of the aptitude.[9] 18

---

5 See note 6.

6 The impelling cause (*causa proēgoumenē*) is the inward impulse, whereas the initiating cause (*causa prokatarktikē*) refers to the external occasion. These causes are distinguished from the proper efficient cause and provide opportunity for it. See Muller, *DLGTT*, 62–63. In the first repetition of the *Synopsis* Polyander uses the Latin synonyms *causa impulsive intrinseca* and *causa extrinseca* or *meritoria*. See Johannes Polyander, *Disputationum theologicarum repetitarum trigesima, de vocatione hominum ad salutem*, resp. Valentius Gerhardi Goarishusanus (Leiden: Elzevir, 1627), thesis 5.

7 Cf. thesis 33 below.

8 The distinction between *universaliter* and *communiter* or *distributive* expresses not that every human being is called, but that everyone who is called belongs to the class of human beings. That some are not called is proved by Jesus' words that he does not call the righteous, but sinners to repentance; cf. the distinctions in thesis 31 below.

9 The distinction expresses that in principle human beings are able to respond, because they

ratione* praeditus, brutoque animali ἀντιδιακριτικῶς oppositus, recte ad Deo, a quo vocatur, auscultandum aptus dicitur; hujus vero respectu, eundem ad Dei vocantis auscultationem prorsus ineptum esse asserimus.

XIX Modus* etenim aptitudinis seu potentiae* in peccatoribus ad Deo vocanti auscultandum, nec est a caeco mentis ipsorum oculo, nec ab obliquo voluntatis* appetitu, nec a surdis carnis affectibus,* sed hic iis a Deo inditur, quibus aures dat ad audiendum, oculos ad videndum, ac pedes ad investigandum ea, quae nobis ad animae salutem in Christo exhibentur. Quo respiciens Bernardus ait, Deum tria in nobis operari, nimirum, *cogitare bonum, velle bonum, et perficere bonum*, *lib. de Grat. et Lib. Arbitr*.[a]

XX Bonum illud, vel est salutis ac beatitatis aeternae nobis in coelis paratae, vel est justitiae Deo gratae, nosque ad beatitatem illam deducentis. Utrumque bonum homo animalis ignorat, teste Apostolo, 1 Cor. 2, 14. 2 Cor. 3, 5. ideoque nec de utroque bono recte dijudicare, nec utrumque apte eligere, nec serio persequi potest.

XXI Quemadmodum utrumque illud bonum nobis per Evangelii praedicationem offertur, sic Spiritus Sanctus serias de utroque cogitationes ac pium utriusque desiderium in cordibus nostris accendit.

XXII Illud boni desiderium ab eo differt desiderio, quod Philosophi voce beatitudinis in suis Ethicis definiunt. Hoc enim est ex instinctu naturali,* illud ex

[a] Bernard of Clairvaux, *Liber de gratia et libero arbitrio* 14.46 (*Sämtliche Werke* 1:240).

are creatures with a will and intellect, but they are not able to respond due to the consequences of sin. A simple comparison is that in principle all people are able to play the piano, but only those who have learned to play it have the right mode of the aptitude.

Regarding the former, human beings, endowed with reason* and logically classified as opposite to dumb animals, are rightly said to be capable of listening to God when he calls them. However, regarding the latter, we affirm that the same people are entirely unsuited to listening to God as He calls.

For the mode* of the aptitude or the ability* that sinners have to listen to 19
God when He calls does not come from the blinded eyes of their own minds, nor from the crooked desires of their wills,* nor from the blunted feelings* of their flesh; but God here bestows it on those people to whom He gives ears to hear, eyes to see, and feet to follow those things that are revealed to us in Christ for the salvation of the soul. With a view to this Bernard says that God works it in us to do three things: "To consider what is good, to will what is good, and to accomplish what is good" (*On Grace and Free Choice*).[10]

The 'good' [of which Bernard speaks] is either the good of salvation and eter- 20
nal blessedness prepared in heaven for us, or the good of righteousness which, as it is pleasing to God, leads us to that blessedness. Both of these good things are not known to the natural man, as the Apostle testifies (1 Corinthians 2:14; 2 Corinthians 3:5), and consequently the natural man is incapable of rightly discerning both of these good things and of duly choosing either of them for himself, nor can he attain them.

And just as each of these good things is offered to us through the preaching 21
of the Gospel, so too does the Holy Spirit kindle solemn thinking in our hearts about both of them and an earnest longing for them.

This longing for the good is different from the desire that the Philosophers in 22
their ethical treatises define by means of the word 'happiness.'[11] For this latter

---

10 Bernard of Clairvaux (1090–1153) was a French abbot and the primary builder of the reforming Cistercian order. His writings were popular with the Reformers; for instance, his mystical imagery of Christ as the Bridegroom influenced Martin Luther. His work *On Grace and Free Choice* resulted from a discussion with an unknown person in which Bernard had seemingly minimized the function of free choice.

11 Philosophers here refers to the ancient Greek philosophers. The concept of *eudaimonia* (in Latin, as here: *beatitudo*) is basic to the ethical systems of ancient Greek philosophy. It is commonly translated in English as 'happiness' or 'welfare' and perhaps best understood today as 'human flourishing.' For the difficulties in translating this term see Richard Kraut, *Aristotle on the Human Good* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), 3, note 1. As Aristotle articulated it in his *Nicomachean Ethics* and *Eudemian Ethics*, *eudaimonia* represents the highest human good, and requires—but is not limited to—living according to 'virtue' (*aretē*). Ethics, together with political philosophy, then examines what *eudaimonia* is and how it can be achieved. The ancients before and after Aristotle all agreed that *eudaimonia* is the highest good and that *arete* forms a constituent part in it, but differed with him and amongst each other on the precise definition of 'happiness' and of the pre-

assensu supernaturali,* nempe fidei in Jesum Christum. Hoc omnibus commune* est, qui in Adamo nascuntur, illud iis proprium est, qui in Christo renascuntur.

XXIII Qui ex illo supernaturali* fidei assensu per Spiritum Sanctum in cordibus nostris accenso, jam ante in iis naturale* verae beatitudinis Evangelio patefactae desiderium latuisse conjiciunt, hi non minus inepte argumentantur, quam si aquae per se frigidae nativam calefaciendi potentiam* inesse statuerent, priusquam eam ab igne calefacta accipiat.

XXIV Hunc fidei assensum nulli vocatorum ex innato beatitudinis, tamquam suae perfectionis,* appetitu inesse, sed iis a Deo, quibus ipsi visum est, inspirari Evangelista Lucas, tum quorundam Gentilium, tum Lydiae exemplo demonstrat, Act. 13. et 16., ubi illi propterea quod ordinati erant ad vitam aeternam, haec, quia Dominus cor ipsius adaperuerat, Evangelio, quod plerisque Judaeis erat scandalo, credidisse dicitur.

XXV Ad istum fidei assensum non omnes et singulos homines vocari per praedicationem Evangelii, luculentis Sacrae Scripturae testimoniis* atque exemplis probari* potest. Nam sicuti sub Veteri Testamento mysterium Christi Gentibus fuit absconditum, solique populo Judaico per Prophetas revelatum, sic illud sub Novo, non omnibus promiscue per Apostolos fuit annuntiatum, sed quibusvis Judaeis et Gentibus, eo tantum loco et tempore, quo Deus illud manifestare constituerat.

XXVI Id Paulus et Timotheus in itinere sunt experti, quod in Asiam ac Bithyniam paraverant, ut ibi Evangelium praedicarent; a quo proposito Deus ipsos per Spiritum suum impedivisse, atque in Macedoniam misisse dicitur, Actor. 16, 6. 7. 10.

XXVII Hallucinantur ergo qui gratiam Dei vocantis ad omnes et singulos homines extendunt. Nam praeterquam quod illam Dei φιλανθρωπίαν, qua Deus omnes homines ut suas creaturas complectitur, cum ista confundunt, qua certos ali-

---

cise connection between it and 'virtue.' With this thesis, Polyander thus re-emphasizes that the content of Christian 'happiness' (or 'blessedness') as he had defined it above in thesis 20 is not to be filled in according to its use by the ancient pagan philosophers.

notion comes by natural* instinct, while the former comes by supernatural* assent, i.e., by faith in Jesus Christ. And the latter is shared* by all those who are born of Adam, while the former belongs only to those who are born again in Christ.

The people who contend on the grounds of the supernatural* assent of faith 23
which the Holy Spirit kindled in our hearts, that the natural* longing for true blessedness as revealed in the Gospel had been lying dormant in them long beforehand, argue no less foolishly than if they held that water, which in and of itself is cold, possesses an innate power to heat before it obtains that power* when being heated by fire.[12]

The evangelist Luke shows clearly that in all those who are called this assent 24
of faith does not arise from some innate longing for blessedness as if for their perfection,* but it is God who inspires it in the people whom he calls in his own good pleasure.[13] For example, in Acts 13[: 48] and 16[:14] he says about some of the gentiles, that they believed the Gospel (which was a stumbling-block to the Jews) because they had been ordained to eternal life; and about Lydia that she believed because God had opened her heart.

It can be demonstrated* with clear witnesses* and examples from Holy 25
Scripture that the preaching of the Gospel does not call each and every person to the assent of faith. For just as in the Old Testament the mystery of Christ was kept hidden from the gentiles and revealed through the prophets only to the Jewish people, so too in the New Testament it was not declared to everyone indiscriminately through the apostles, but only to whichever Jews and gentiles happened to be in that place and at that time God had ordained for making it known.

Paul and Timothy experienced this on their mission journey: while they had 26
prepared to go into Asia and Bithynia in order to preach the Gospel in those places, God through his own Spirit hindered their plans and sent them into Macedonia (Acts 16:6–7, 10).

Therefore they are idle dreamers who extend God's gracious calling to 27
each and every human being. For they mix up God's love towards humanity (whereby God embraces all people as his own creatures) with the love whereby

12 The background of this example is the idea that fire—and not water—has the *potentia* in itself to heat and that water can heat only when it first is made hot by the fire.

13 Polyander does not deny that people have a longing for happiness/blessedness or the perfection/righteousness leading to that blessedness (see his twofold definition of the 'good' in thesis 20 above), but that this is the ground from which true faith arises. According to Augustine human nature, even in its fallen state, could not lose its longing for blessedness (*appetitus beatitudinis*). See Augustine, *Enchiridion 8.25* (*CCSL 46:63*).

quos ex communi* hominum peccatorum suo vitio pereuntium turba in gratiam suscipere atque in Filio dilectionis suae Jesu Christo prosequi decrevit: Deum nemini obstrictum omni spoliant libertate, ex perduellibus misericordia sua pariter indignis, quos vult, ab aliis segregandi, ut eos ex statu reatus, in statum gratiae* transferat.

XXVIII Quae tamen sententia de gratia* universali nonnullis adeo blanditur, ut eam triplici argumento ex sacris literis probari* posse persuasissimum habeant.

XXIX Primum ipsorum argumentum iis nititur sacrorum Bibliorum testimoniis,* quae Christum ex communi* omnium hominum natura* carnem suam assumpsisse asseverant; sed quam absurde ex hujusmodi communione naturali* spiritualis eorundem hominum cum Christo communio colligatur, ex ipsius Christi effato liquet, quo carnem suam ex se absque Spiritu ac veritate nemini ad salutem prodesse asserit, Joh. 6, 63. nec non ex limitatione Apostoli, qua omnes qui cum Christo sunt ex uno parente, ad eos restringit qui sunt hujus fratres in medio Ecclesiae, ac pueri huic a Deo Patre dati, Hebr. 2, 11. 12. 13.

XXX Secundum argumentum sumitur ex Adami comparatione cum Christo, Rom. 5, 12.[a] Quam comparationem ab ipsis perperam intelligi ex ipsa utriusque Adami descriptione ostendi potest. Prior enim Adamus, Christi typus, ut

[a] Samuel Huber, *Theses, Christum Jesum esse mortuum pro peccatis omnium hominum* (Tübingen: Georg Gruppenbach, 1590), 14–16 (§§ 48–60), 36 (§ 142). And idem, *Confutatio brevis, Libri sub alieno nomine editi, de controversia inter theologos Wittebergenses et Samuelem Huberum de electione* (Mühlhausen: n.p., 1595), 35 (§ 10).

He has ordained to take into his grace a select number of people from the common* crowd of sinners who are perishing for their own wickedness, and to guide them in Jesus Christ, the Son in whom He delights.[14] And in so doing, they also rob God, who is beholden to no-one, of all his freedom to set apart some whom He chooses from all those enemies of his who are equally undeserving of his mercy in order to transform them from their condition of guilt into the condition of his grace.*

However, this notion about God's universal grace* is so appealing to some 28
people that they actually think they can prove* it very convincingly with three arguments from the sacred writings.[15]

Their first argument rests on those witnesses* in the holy books which affirm 29
that Christ assumed his flesh from the nature* that is common* to all human beings. But the pronouncement by Christ himself, who declares that his own flesh by itself and apart from the Spirit and the truth can benefit no-one unto salvation (John 6:63), makes it clear how foolish it is to make a link from this common nature* in the flesh to a spiritual communion of those same human beings with Christ. This is clear also from the apostle's restriction, as he limits all people who with Christ are of the same family, to them who are his brothers in the midst of the congregation, and who are the children given to him by God the Father (Hebrews 2:11–13).

Their second argument is taken from a similarity that they draw between 30
Adam and Christ (Romans 5:12), a similarity incorrectly understood, as can be shown from the portrayal there of the two Adams. For the apostle defines the

14 According to Arminius, "the moving cause [of the call to salvation] is the grace, mercy and philanthropy of God our Savior, by which he is inclined to relieve the misery of sinful man, and to impart unto him eternal felicity." (*Works* 1:571). Before the Synod of Dort, Lucas Trelcatius Sr. (1542–1602) regarded the *philanthropia* of God as the efficient cause of the external calling; see Lucas Trelcatius Sr., *Disputationum theologicarum repetitarum quadragesima-prima, de vocatione hominum ad salutem*, respond. Hadrianus Wittius (Leiden: Joannes Patius, 1599), thesis 4. Cf. Van den Belt, "*Vocatio* in the Leiden Disputations," 555.

15 Polyander seems to be referring to the views of the Lutheran theologian Samuel Huber (1547–1624), who had defended a 'universalism' in the wake of the predestinarian debates between Theodore Beza and Jakob Andreae at the Colloquy of Montbéliard (1586). See Robert Kolb, *Bound Choice, Election, and Wittenberg Theological Method: From Martin Luther to the Formula of Concord* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 181, 265–266; and Gottfried Adam, *Der Streit um die Prädestination im ausgehenden 16. Jahrhundert: Eine Untersuchung zu den Entwürfen von Samuel Huber und Aegidius Hunnius* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1970), 80–83. Only the latter two of three arguments he addresses here could be identified, however.

caput et principium* omnium hominum in peccatis conceptorum, posterior, nempe Christus, ut caput hominum fide justificatorum ab Apostolo definitur, ut innuat, prioris peccatum ad omnes ipsius posteros per naturam* communem* promanare, posterioris vero beneficium solis credentibus ab illa communi sorte exemptis per gratiam specialem communicari.

XXXI Tertium argumentum petitur ex promissionibus vocationis ad salutarem Dei cognitionem, signo tenus universalibus, quales sunt, *Omnes docti erunt a Deo*, Joh. 6, 45. *Effundam ex Spiritu meo in omnem carnem*, Act. 2, 17. et similes.[a] Quo universalitatis signo, nimirum, *Omnes*, non singula generum, sed genera singulorum denotantur, ut patet ex thesi 25. et 26. nec non ex quotidiana experientia, atque ex iis Sacrae Scripturae locis, in quibus vox, *Omnes*, ad quosvis homines distributive refertur, qui absque ullo gentis, aetatis atque sexus discrimine ad salutarem illam Dei cognitionem per Evangelii ministerium evocantur, ut Rom. 1, 14. Eph. 2, 17. 1 Tim. 2, 1. 3. 4. Tit, 2, 2. 3. 6. 9. 11. etc.

XXXII Modus* vocationis opposite consideratus in externum et internum distinguitur. Ille foris per verbi et Sacramentorum* administrationem, hic intus per operationem Spiritus Sancti peragitur.

XXXIII Non semper Deus utrumque vocationis modum* ad hominum conversionem sibi possibilem adhibet, sed quosdam interno tantum Spiritus Sancti lumine ac numine absque externo verbi sui ministerio ad se vocat. Qui vocationis modus per se quidem est ad salutem sufficiens, sed rarus admodum, extraordinarius, nobisque incognitus.

[a] Huber, *Theses, Christum Jesum*, 31 (§ 122–123); and idem, *Confutatio brevis*, 37 (§ 20).

first Adam as a type of Christ, as the head and chief* of all people who are conceived in sin, but the second Adam, namely Christ as the head of people who have been justified by faith, in order to intimate that while the sin of the former flows forth to all his descendants through their common* nature,* the benefit of the latter on the other hand is shared only with believers who have been removed from that common lot through a particular grace.

31 For the third argument they look to the promises of the calling unto the saving knowledge of God, which as far as their wording goes are universal, like: "They all shall be taught by God" (John 6:45), "I shall pour out my Spirit upon all flesh" (Acts 2:17), and similar texts.[16] But regarding the universal application in the wording, surely "all" stands not for particular elements within classes of kinds, but for classes of particular elements, as is obvious from thesis 25 and 26.[17] This is obvious also from everyday experience, and those places in Holy Scripture where the word 'all' refers in the distributive sense to all sorts of people who, without any discrimination in race, age, or gender are being called to that saving knowledge of God through the ministry of the Gospel (as in Romans 1:14; Ephesians 2:17; 1 Timothy 2:1, 3–4; Titus 2:2–3, 6, 9, 11, etc.).

32 The way* of calling, when we examine it from opposing perspectives, is divided into external and internal. The former is achieved outwardly through the administration of Word and sacraments,* the latter inwardly through the working of the Holy Spirit.

33 God does not always apply both ways* of calling that are possible for him to convert people [together], but He calls some people to himself only by the internal light and divine power of the Holy Spirit apart from the outward ministry of his Word. Whereas this way of calling is sufficient to salvation by itself, it is very rare, extraordinary, and to us unknown.

16 Note that both texts are quotations from the Old Testament (Isaiah 54:13 and Joel 2:28), thus the refuted argument is drawn from the universality of the New Testament era proclaimed in the Old Testament promises.

17 In scholastic thought something universal can either be distributed in all the individual cases of the sort (*singula generum*) or in the common sort of the individual cases (*genera singulorum*). An example of the first is that every human being is a sinner, and of the second that a human being is inclined to every (sort of) sin. The distinction was often used to explain the texts in Scripture that imply some kind of universal salvation. Calvin, for instance in his *Commentary on 1 Timothy* 2:4, explains the statement that God "wishes that all men may be saved" by claiming that this "relates to classes of men, and not to individual persons" (*de hominum generibus, non singulis personis*) (*CO* 52:268).

XXXIV Nec semper Deus utrumque vocationis modum* pari eademque ratione conjungit, sed utriusque concursus est in quibusdam efficax, in quibusdam inefficax.

XXXV Concursus utriusque inefficax in triplici hominum genere conspicitur. Alii enim luce veritatis Evangelicae collustrati, ad eam amplectendam non afficiuntur. Hi semen Evangelii secundum viam tritam excipiunt, Matt. 13, 19.

XXXVI Alii lucem veritatis animo conceptam curis ac voluptatibus hujus mundi suffocari permittunt. Hi semen Evangelii inter spinas excipiunt, Matt. 13, 22.

XXXVII Aliis Spiritus Sanctus levem suae gratiae gustum praebet, quo corda ipsorum momentaneo laetitiae sensu afficiuntur. Hi semen Evangelii in terra petrosa excipiunt, Matt. 13, 20.

XXXVIII Concursus utriusque ad salutem efficax ab iis percipitur, in quibus Spiritus Sanctus vivae fidei in Christo radicatae πληροφορίαν seu fiduciam ingenerat, qua promissionem gratiae interno ipsius testimonio* obsignatam sibi firmiter ac perseveranter applicant. Hi semen Evangelii in terram bonam excipiunt, Matt. 13, 23.

34 Nor does God always link the two ways* of calling equally or in the same way, but the concurrence of both of them is effective in some people and ineffective in others.[18]

35 The ineffective concurrence of the two ways is observed in three kinds of people. For some people are not moved to embrace it, even though the light of the evangelical truth has shone fully upon them. These are the people who receive the seed of the Gospel that is sown along the trodden path (Matthew 13:19).

36 Other people allow the light of the truth that they have taken up in their hearts to be choked by the cares and pleasures of this world. These receive the Gospel like seed sown among the thorns (Matthew 13:22).

37 To other people the Holy Spirit offers a little taste of his grace so that their hearts are touched by a momentary feeling of happiness. These receive the Gospel like seed on rocky soil (Matthew 13:20).[19]

38 The effective concurrence of both ways is perceived by those people in whom the Holy Spirit ingenerates the full assurance or confidence of a living faith that is rooted in Christ,[20] whereby they steadfastly and with perseverance apply to themselves the promise of grace that was sealed with his own inner testimony.* These people receive the Gospel like seed sown in good soil (Matthew 13:23).

---

18 The idea of concurrence (*concursus*) also occurs in the disputation on providence *SPT* 11.13 and 25, but there it refers to the way God's providence relates to human activities. God makes them possible, but does not always approve of them. Here in disputation 30 'concurrence' refers to the external and the internal callings that mostly, but not necessarily, concur. Even if they do concur that is not always efficacious. According to Arminius the concurrence of the outward and inward call was efficacious, be it that the effect ultimately depended on the consent of the believer. After the Synod of Dort, Reformed theologians felt a need to specify when and how the internal call had effect and did no longer teach that the concurrence of the outward and inward calls was always salvific. Cf. Van den Belt, "*Vocatio* in the Leiden Disputations," 552.

19 It is remarkable that Polyander changes the order of the parable where the seed sown among the thorns follows the seed sown on rocky soil. There seems to be an increasing emphasis on the internal work of the Spirit from "the light of the evangelical truth has shone fully upon them" via "the light of the truth that they have taken up in their hearts" to "the little taste of the Spirit's grace and the momentary feeling of happiness."

20 The Greek word *plērophoria* occurs in Scripture for assurance or certain confidence, e.g. Hebrews 10:22, and is used by John Calvin to denote the certainty of one's own salvation; over against doubt about God's grace he places "a far different feeling of *plērophoria* that in the Scriptures is always attributed to faith" (*Institutes* 3.2.15). In Reformed theology it stands for the assurance that characterizes saving faith. See also *SPT* 5.8, 31.18, 20 and 35.41.

XXXIX Ob diversum illum vocationis internae concursum cum externa, hypocritae cum vere Israëlitis in Ecclesia visibili (quae est vocatorum coetus) permiscentur. Cujus permistionis respectu boni dicuntur et mali ad Filii et Agni Dei nuptias invitari, Matt. 22, 4. multique vocati, pauci electi, Matt. 20, 16.

XL Quamvis dona nonnulla ex utriusque vocationis concursu profluentia, atque hypocritis cum electis communia, nimirum, donum cognitionis ac gustus boni Dei verbi virtutumque futuri seculi, hypocritis ad salutem non sufficiant, in electis tamen sunt ad salutem προπαρασκευαστικὰ, ac secundum Dei erga ipsos εὐδοκίαν, praevia gratiae amplioris, qua alii jure merito destituuntur, propterea quod prioribus illis donis non recte utantur.

XLI Priorum proinde donorum illorum abusu hypocritae coram Deo redduntur inexcusabiles, cum ex malae mentis ἀχαριστίᾳ, sese mundi inquinamentis, quae per Jesu Christi cognitionem effugerant, rursum implicant, 2 Pet. 2, 20.

XLII Nullus vocationis modus* motusque est coactus, aut violentus, sed suavis, et ad obliquam ejus, qui movetur, voluntatem* in melius vertendam congruenter adhibitus, ut ex nolente fiat volens.

XLIII Hunc vocationis modum* ac motum Christus trahendi vocabulo designat, Joh. 6, 44. ne quis eum sibi, sed soli Deo acceptum ferat. Qui enim ad Christi communicationem aliunde trahitur, is ad eam desiderandam, non ex proprio suo fertur arbitrio,* sed vi trahentis flectitur.

XLIV Qua auctoritate Deus, quos vult, ad Agni sui nuptias invitat, eadem alios ex iis hora prima, alios tertia, alios sexta, vel nona, alios denique undecima in vineam suam vocat.

XLV Forma vocationis efficacis, qua ab inefficaci distinguitur, in salutari consistit hujus beneficii applicatione, qua nonnulli peccatores ex natura* communi ad gratiam singularem, ex societate infidelium ad communionem fidelium, atque ex regno tenebrarum ad regnum lucis aeternae transferuntur.

XLVI Finis* ultimus utrique Vocationi, tam inefficaci, quam efficaci communis,* est misericordiae divinae erga eos, quos vocat, manifestatio. Finis* vocationis efficacis subordinatus, eique proprius, est salutaris gratiae* divinae communicatio; inefficacis autem vocationis finis* accidentalis,* est inobedientiae contu-

Because of the variety in the concurrence of the internal call with the outward one, hypocrites mingle among the true people of Israel within the visible Church (which is the gathering of those who have been called). It is with regard to this mixture that both the good and the evil are said to be invited to the wedding banquet of the Son, the Lamb of God (Matthew 22:4), and that many are called, but few are chosen (Matthew 20:16). 39

Although some gifts flow forth from the concurrence of the two callings and are shared by hypocrites along with the elect (i.e., the gift of knowing and tasting God's good Word, and the virtues of the coming age),[21] they are not sufficient for the salvation of the hypocrites. But in the elect they prepare the way for their salvation and—by God's good pleasure towards them—these gifts do lead the way to more abundant grace, of which others are rightly, deservedly deprived because they do not employ those first gifts in the right way. 40

Hence by their abuse of those first gifts the hypocrites are rendered without excuse before God, since from the ingratitude of their evil hearts they once again entangle themselves in the corruptions of the world from which they had escaped through knowing Jesus Christ (2 Peter 2:20). 41

None of the ways* and movements of the calling is forced or impetuous, but sweet and suitably applied to turning the crooked will* of the one who is moved for the better, so that from unwilling he becomes willing. 42

Christ uses the word 'draw' for this way* and movement of calling (John 6:44) so that no-one should think that he himself had undertaken it, but only God. For whoever is drawn into communion with Christ from elsewhere is not brought to desire it by his own decision* but is turned to it by the strength of the one who draws him. 43

God, with the same authoritative will whereby He invites those whom he wants to the wedding banquet of his Lamb, also calls some of them into his vineyard in the first hour, others in the third, yet again others in the sixth or the ninth, and lastly others in the eleventh hour. 44

The form of the effective calling by which it is distinguished from the ineffective one, consists in the saving application of this benefit which takes some sinners from their natural* communion to that particular grace, from the company of faithless ones into communion with those who are faithful, and from the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of everlasting light. 45

The highest goal* of both callings (shared* by both the ineffective and the effective one) is the manifestation of God's mercy towards those whom He calls. The subordinate goal* of the effective calling, and [the goal] proper to it, is the saving imparting of God's grace;* but the accidental* goal* of the ineffective 46

21 Hebrews 6:6.

macis, ac prorsus inexcusabilis convictio in iis, qui Spiritui Sancto per os Evangelistarum loquenti petulanter resistunt atque obloquuntur. Ex quo discrimine Evangelium aliis esse dicitur odor vitae ad vitam, aliis odor mortis ad mortem, 2 Cor. 2, 15. 16.

XLVII Effecta sunt fides, justificatio, sanctificatio et glorificatio, de quibus postea disputabitur.

XLVIII Quod haec effecta non ab omnibus, sed quibusdam tantum vocatis percipiantur, id non fit ex virtutis Dei omnipotentis defectu, sed ex solo ipsius arbitratu. Sua enim virtute infinita* Deus vitium infirmitatis humanae, non minus in illis, quam in his, si vellet, emendare posset,* cum omnia, quae vult efficere, semper efficiat, Ps. 115, 3.

calling is the conviction of stubborn disobedience and complete inexcusableness in the hearts of those who impudently withstand and interrupt the Holy Spirit as He speaks through the mouths of the preachers.[22] From this distinction 2 Corinthians 2:15–16 calls the Gospel the aroma of life unto life for some, and for others the aroma of death to death.

The effects of the calling are faith, justification, sanctification, and glorification. These will be treated in later disputations. 47

The fact that these effects are not received by everyone but only by some of the people who have been called does not happen due to some shortcoming of God's omnipotent power, but happens only by his choosing. For by his infinite* power God could* (if He willed so) emend the vice of human weakness no less in the former people than in the latter, since He always accomplishes everything that He wills to accomplish (Psalm 115:3). 48

22 The Latin term *finis* (goal, end) is a crucial concept in the theory of action. The *finis ultimus* is the ultimate goal of an action, while the *finis subordinatus* is subordinate to it, though it still can be *proprius*, proper or according to its literal and original intention. The *finis accidens* is not essential to the goal but as it were a side effect of it. See also the discussion of the multiform goal of justification in *SPT* 33.32.

DISPUTATIO XXXI

De Fide et Perseverantia Sanctorum[a]

Praeside D. ANDREA RIVETO
Respondente PAULO TESTARDO

THESIS I Etsi vocationis divinae ad salutem, remotus* et ultimus finis* sit electorum salus, et gloria Dei; finis tamen proximus* est, ut vocanti Deo et Christo per *Fidem* respondeant. Nam postquam constituit nobis Christum Redemptorem misericors Pater, per eum hac lege succurrere nobis voluit, ut solida fide misericordiam ejus amplectamur. Nunc igitur postquam de Christo, ejus officiis, beneficiis, et vocatione ad eorum participationem, actum est, expendere convenit, qualis haec esse fides debeat, per quam regni coelestis possessionem adeunt, quicunque ad adoptionem filiorum vocati sunt.

[a] The original disputation was published as Andreas Rivetus, *Disputationum theologicarum trigesima-prima, de fide et perseverantia sanctorum*, resp. Paulus Testardus (Leiden: Isaac Elzevir, 1622) and was dated July 13 and 16, 1622. The double defense was justified because of the abundance and distinctiveness of the content ("propter ubertatem et distincionem materiae"); the first oral defense regarded faith and the second perseverance.

DISPUTATION 31

On Faith and the Perseverance of the Saints

President: Andreas Rivetus
Respondent: Paulus Testardus[1]

Whereas the salvation of the elect and the glory of God is the removed,* ultimate end* in the divine calling unto salvation, the proximate* end is that people respond by faith when God and Christ call them. For after the Father in his compassion appointed Christ as our Redeemer, it was his will to come to our aid through Christ by this rule: that we embrace his mercy by a sure faith. Therefore, after having given a treatment of Christ, his offices, benefits, and his call to share in them, now is a suitable time for us to treat what this faith ought to be like, whereby all those who have been called to the adoption as sons come to possess the heavenly kingdom.[2] 1

1 Paul Testard (c. 1596–1650), *sieur* de la Fontaine, came from Blois and studied theology at the academy of Saumur under John Cameron (c. 1579–1625), whose fervent disciple he would become. Testard is not listed in the matriculation records of Leiden University, and rather studied here under his famed countryman Andreas Rivetus while accompanying a young French nobleman as his tutor. Upon his return to France, Testard served as pastor to the church at the court of Duke Henri-Charles de la Trémoille (1624–1626) and then at Blois (1626–1650). See Eugène and Émile Haag, *La France protestante*, 10 vols. (Paris: Joel Cherbuliez, 1846–1858), 9:356–357, and Albert Gootjes, *Claude Pajon (1626–1685) and the Academy of Saumur: The First Controversy over Grace*, Brill's Series in Church History, 64 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 55–56. Rivetus explicitly used this disputation to attack Cameron (see thesis 9 below), as is clear from the letter from J.M. de Langle to A. Rivetus, London, 4/14.8.1622, in Leiden, UBL, BPL 278/4 (transcription from Jean-Luc Tulot at jeanluc.tulot.pagesperso-orange.fr/Rivet-Langle.pdf, page 12; last accessed 17.10.2013). This may well explain the absence of a dedication from the respondent Testard, a fervent Cameronian. Testard's teacher Cameron would have been the most natural choice as dedicatee.

2 The structure of the disputation is as follows: A. On Faith (theses 1–29): 1) 'Faith' and its different meanings (theses 2–8), definition of 'saving faith' (thesis 6), 2) the efficient cause of faith (theses 9–10) and instrumental causes of faith (theses 11–12), 3) the matter of faith: in its subjects (theses 13–18) and in its objects, both material (theses 19–23) and formal (theses 24–25), 4) the form of faith (theses 26–27), 5) the goal or end of faith (thesis 28), 6) the effects of faith (thesis 29). B. On perseverance (theses 29–42): 1) 'Perseverance' and its different meanings (thesis 31–33); definition of 'perseverance' (thesis 33), 2) the efficient cause of perseverance (theses 34–35), 3) the matter of perseverance, in its subjects (theses 36–38) and in its objects (theses 39–40), 4) the goal of perseverance (thesis 41), 5) the effects of perseverance (thesis 42).

II Cum autem variae sint nominis* fidei acceptiones, priusquam ad ejus naturam* explicandam aggrediamur, removendae sunt quae ad institutum nostrum non pertinent. Et primum quia non de humana, sed divina fide agendum, omittimus vulgarem illam fidei acceptionem pro assensu, quo sibi mutuo fidem homines adhibent. 2. De fide non loquimur quam damus cum alicui pollicemur;[a] quo sensu Deo ipsi fidem tribuimus, id est, veritatem et constantiam in dictis et factis. 3. Non agimus de fide quatenus accipitur pro objecto fidei, ut vocant, materiali, id est, pro rebus credendis, quae etiam fidei nomine* aliquando in Scriptura intelliguntur. 4. Neque de fide quatenus per metonymiam accipitur pro signo et Sacramento* fidei.

III Quaestio tota est de Fide quam adhibemus, cum credimus Deo revelanti nobis veritatem alicujus rei, cui firmiter assentimur propter asseverationem ipsius, cujus communiter quatuor species* traduntur; quae etsi uno nomine* generali comprehendantur, univocae tamen non sunt. Discriminantur autem additis epithetis, *Historicae, Temporariae, Miraculorum et Justificantis*. At temporariam ab historica non sic distinguimus ut diversam speciem proprie* constituat, sed ejus duos quasi gradus vel actus* facimus. Cum enim historica illa fides, quam *Dogmaticam* alii appellant, sit habitus* quo quis credit vera esse omnia a Deo revelata; vel in eo subsistit, ut de veritate rei persuasus sit credens, sine ullo interiori affectu,* vel in revelantem, vel in rem revelatam; et hic est primus gradus plane theoreticus; vel conjungitur haec theoria cum aliquo sensu et gustu, et cum gaudio, ejusque externis signis, qui secundus est gradus, ad Fidem quae πρόσκαιρος dicitur, pertinens. Hi duo gradus ita inter se conferun-

[a] damus cum quid alicui asserimus, aut promittimus: 1642.

And since different meanings* are accepted for the word 'faith,' we should 2
set to one side those meanings that are not relevant to our undertaking, and then proceed to explain its nature.* And first of all, since we shall be treating godly faith and not the human kind, we leave aside the commonly accepted meaning of faith, that it is the assent whereby people extend their faith or trust to each other. Secondly, we are not speaking about the faith that we give when we affirm or promise something to someone. We do ascribe faith in this sense to God himself, that is, the steadfast truth of his words and deeds. Thirdly, we are not dealing with faith insofar as the word is used for the content of faith, or the material object of faith (as it is called), that is: the things that are to believed, the things that in Scripture are sometimes also meant by the word* 'faith.'[3] Fourth, we are not using it for faith insofar as the sign and sacrament* of faith are meant by it through metonymy.[4]

The entire question is about the faith that we exercise when we believe God, 3
who reveals to us the truth of something, when we give strong assent to him on account of his assurance. It is common to propose four 'species'* of faith, and although they are all included in the one general word* 'faith,' they do not have one and the same meaning. For we make distinctions between them by adding epithets: historical, temporary, in miracles, and justifying.[5] But we do not distinguish the temporary from the historical faith to such an extent that each forms a different species in a proper sense,* but we make two steps (as it were), or stages, or acts* of faith.[6] For that historical faith, which some call 'dogmatic,' is the disposition* whereby someone believes that everything God has revealed is true or it exists in the fact that the believer is persuaded about the truth of something, apart from having any inner feeling,* either toward the one who reveals it or to the thing that is revealed. And this is the first stage, which is entirely theoretical. Or this theory is linked to some feeling, or tasting, or joy, and to outward indications of it. This is the second stage, and it concerns the faith that is called *proskairos*, temporary.[7] These two stages are related to

3 Medieval Scholastics like Thomas Aquinas (*Summa theologiae* 1/2.1.1) distinguished between the 'formal' and the 'material' object of faith. The former is the first truth, which is God as revealing (cf. thesis 3 and 24 below). Other things can also be the (material) object, but only insofar as God has revealed them. See also *SPT* 31.19 and *DLGTT* s.v. "objectum fidei."

4 Baptism is called the "sacrament of faith." Augustine already said that because of the similarity between the sacrament as a sign and what it signifies, the sacrament of faith is faith, as the sacrament of the body of the Lord is the body of the Lord. *Epistula* 98.9 (CSEL 34:530–531).

5 See *DLGTT* s.v. "fides."

6 See also thesis 7 below.

7 The adjective *proskairos* occurs in the parable of the sower (Matthew 13:21, Mark 4:17), where it is used of those who have no root in themselves and whose faith lasts only for a while.

tur, ut secundus primum supponat, non contra primus secundum. Historicam autem fidem non appellamus, quod narrationes tantum pro objecto habeat; complectitur enim promissiones etiam, saltem ita ut credatur earum veritas in se* et potentia* promittentis; etsi qui historice tantum credit, eas sibi non applicet firmiter, neque de voluntate* divina erga se certus sit.

IV Fides *miraculorum* (quam alii latiori acceptione fidem *promissionum particularium* appellare malunt, quia etiam ea fide credimus particulares promissiones de bono aliquo temporali aut spirituali omnibus electis non communi,* et quibusdam non electis communicato,) est qua firmiter statuimus eventurum ex Dei potentia,* quod vel praedixerit Deus, vel fieri voluerit, sive a nobis, sive in bonum nostrum ab aliis, quae non ad universum Dei verbum, ut praecedens, se extendit, sed ad singularem quandam revelationem. Diximus, quod fieri voluerit sive a nobis, sive in bonum nostrum ab aliis, quod exprimere voluerunt qui eandem in *activam* et *passivam* distinxerunt. Activam appellarunt, peculiare Dei donum quo quis credit se divina potentia aliquid miraculose operaturum vel alias effecturum. Passivam, qua quis statuit se participem fore beneficiorum singularium, quae per miracula, aut alio modo ex speciali promissione Dei contingunt. Exemplum prioris habetur, 1 Cor. 13, 2. posterioris Act. 14, 9.

V Recte autem Augustinus (de Fide et oper. c. 14.):[a] *Paulus non quamlibet fidem qua in Deum creditur, sed eam* SALUBREM *planeque* EVANGELICAM *definivit, cujus opera ex dilectione procedunt*. Eadem est quam nos *Justificantem* et *Salvificam* appellamus; non enim (ut id obiter dicamus) probamus eorum sententiam qui aliam volunt esse fidem *Justificantem* a *Salvifica*, quasi essent qui fide justificante donati, salvifica tandem destituerentur, cum Scriptura pro eodem accipiat, *gratia salvari per fidem, non ex operibus*, Eph. 2, 8. *Et justificari fide*, vel *justificari gratia*, Gal. 2, 16. Tit. 3, 7.

[a] Augustine, *De fide et operibus* 14 (CSEL 41:62).

each other in such a way that the second stage assumes the presence of the first one, but not the other way around. But we do not give the first one the name 'historical faith' as though narrative accounts are its only subject-matter. For it entails also the promises, at least to the extent that their veracity as such* is believed; and so too is believed the capability* of him who makes the promise. But someone who believes the promises only in a historical way, does not apply them to himself steadfastly nor is he convinced that the divine will* is directed at him.

[And there is] faith in miracles, which others prefer to use in a broader sense 4
and to call 'faith in particular promises,'[8] since with that faith, too, we believe particular promises of some temporal or spiritual good that not all of the elect share,* or that is bestowed on some people who are not elect. With this faith we steadfastly determine that what God either has foretold or has willed to happen is in fact going to come about through the power* of God either by us or by other people, for our good. Like the previous one, this kind of faith does not extend to the entire Word of God, but only to some special revelation. Those who divide this kind of faith into active and passive want to say the same thing as we said: that God willed it to happen either by us or by others for our good. They have given the name 'active' to that special gift of God whereby someone believes that he himself is about to perform something miraculous (or in some other way bring it about) through the power of God. [They call it] 'passive' faith when someone determines that he will partake of singular benefits that come about by God's special promise through miracles or some other means. An example of the former is in 1 Corinthians 13:2, and of the latter in Acts 14:9.[9]

And Augustine rightly [states] that Paul did not define faith as any kind 5
of faith whereby one believes in God, but he defined it as 'life-giving faith' and 'gospel faith' from which come forth works of love (*On Faith and Works*, chapter 14). It is the same faith that we call 'justifying and saving faith.' And, to make a comment in passing, we do not approve the opinion of those who want justifying faith to be different from saving faith,[10] as though there are people who have been granted justifying faith but in the end were withheld saving faith. For Scripture takes them as one and the same: "To be saved by grace through faith and not because of works" (Ephesians 2:8). And: "To be justified through by faith" or "to be justified by grace" (Galatians 2:16; Titus 3:7).

---

8 It is not clear to whom Rivetus is referring here.

9 In 1 Corinthians 13:2 "a faith that can move mountains" is an example of 'active' faith in miracles; in Acts 14:9 the man who "had faith to be healed" by Paul illustrates the 'passive' faith in miracles.

10 It is not clear to whom Rivetus is referring here.

VI Estque fides illa *salvifica*, ex certa revelationis divinae *notitia*, firmus a Spiritu Sancto per verbum Evangelii animis nostris ingeneratus *assensus*, omnibus quae nobis Deus in verbo suo patefecit, sed praesertim promissionibus salutaribus in Christo factis, quo certa fiducia in Deo acquiescens, firmiter unusquisque fidelis statuit, non solum promissam esse credentibus in genere remissionem peccatorum, sed sibi in particulari concessam, aeternamque justitiam, et ex ea vitam, ex Dei misericordia propter unius Jesu Christi meritum donatam esse.

VII Ex dictis liquet, differentiam esse inter illas fidei species* aut acceptiones, nec unam et eandem esse, historicam, miraculorum, et promissionum fidem, ut vult Bellarm. cap. 4. lib. 1. de Justif.[a] Primus enim historicae vel dogmaticae gradus, etsi notitia et assensu conveniat cum justificante, tamen quia caret gustu et effectu,[b] et Diabolis etiam communis* est, qui credunt et contremiscunt, Jac. 2, 19. non potest* ad fidem salvificam pertingere. Secundus vero, etsi cum notitia et assensu mentis conjunctum habeat effectum aliquem, quia levis et momentaneus est, qualis est eorum qui amant tamquam aliquando osuri, ex causis caducis natus, ut jucunditate cognitionis hominum favore, terrenorum commodorum spe, etc. In iis, qui utut Christum amare videantur, aliud habent quod intus ament, fidei justificantis proprietate vera caret, quae sine sincero et firmo amore nulla est. Fidem autem miraculorum seu promissionum singularium, cum justificante eandem non esse, satis id evincit. 1. Quod concessa fuit iis quos Christus *non novit*, id est, non approbavit,[c] Matt. 7, 22. imo Judae perditionis filio, Matt. 10, 1. 2. Quod multi fidem justificantem habuerunt, quibus non est concessa gratia miraculorum, aut specialium promissionum. Cum ergo possint* separari, et reipsa separentur, unum et idem esse non possunt.*

VIII Id tamen non imus inficias, si tres illae species* in uno et eodem subjecto* concurrant, ut in Apostolis et aliis quibusdam Christi servis accidit, tum non plures fidei habitus* constituere, sed unum et eundem saltem aggregatione, ut sit eadem ferme analogia* inter has fidei species* seu modos* quae inter animas vegetativam, sensitivam et rationalem, quae etsi diversas constituant viventium species,* interdum ad unius animae constitutionem concurrunt. Et

---

[a] Bellarmine, *De iustificatione* 1.4 (*Opera* 6:154a). [b] affectu:* original disputation. [c] id est approbavit: 1642.

And that saving faith is a firm assent—based on the certain knowledge of 6
divine revelation—ingenerated in our minds by the Holy Spirit through the word of the Gospel, an assent to everything that God has revealed to us in his Word, and especially to the promises of life that were made in Christ; hereby each and every believer, relying with constant confidence in God, steadfastly determines that forgiveness of sins was promised not only to believers generally but also granted to him in particular, and that he himself has received eternal righteousness and from it, life, out of God's mercy because of the merit of Jesus Christ alone.

These words make it clear that there are differences among those kinds* or 7
concepts of faith and that historical faith, faith in miracles, and faith in the promises are not identical, as Bellarmine would have it (*On Justification*, book 1, chapter 4). For the first stage, that of historical or dogmatic faith, while it is the same as justifying faith in knowledge and assent, yet because it lacks tasting and effect,[11] and is also shared* by the demons, who believe and tremble in fear (James 2:19), therefore it cannot* belong to saving faith. As for the second stage, [that of faith in miracles], although there is some effect that accompanies the knowledge and intellectual assent, yet because it is flighty and momentary it is like those people who are in love but capable of hate at any moment, and this faith was grounded in motives that are fleeting, like the pleasure of knowledge, or the goodwill of people, or the hope for earthly goods, etc. These people, though they seem to love Christ, within their hearts they love something else, and they lack what is really characteristic of justifying faith—which, if it doesn't have sincere and steadfast love, is null. And the following succeeds in proving that faith in miracles or special promises is not the same as justifying faith: 1) The fact that faith in miracles was granted to those whom Christ "has not known" (Matthew 7:22), that is, whom he did not commend—even to Judas, "the son of perdition" (Matthew 10:1). 2) The fact that there are many who have had justifying faith, yet have not been granted the gift of miracles or special promises. Therefore since these two things can be,* and in fact are, separate, they cannot* be one and the same thing.

And yet we do agree that whenever those three kinds* of faith flow together 8
in one and the same subject,* as happened in the case of the apostles and some of the other servants of Christ, they do not form numerous dispositions* of faith but they actually add up to one and the same disposition—so that there is almost an exact analogy* between these kinds* or modes* of faith as there is between souls: a vegetative, sensitive, and rational soul, which although they constitute diverse species* of living things, they do flow together occasionally

11 See thesis 3 above.

quemadmodum anima vegetativa et sensitiva in homine peculiarem habent rationem: sic et fides historica et miraculorum in justificato, quia ad fidem justificantem referuntur, et ab ea perficiuntur. In eo tamen discrimen est, quod anima rationalis necessario vegetativam et sensitivam supponit: Fides vero justificans etsi historicam semper habeat conjunctam, potest tamen a miraculorum fide separari.

IX Hujus fidei causa* efficiens princeps, est Deus Pater in Filio per Spiritum Sanctum, qui mentem illuminat, et voluntatem,* alioquin a Deo aversam, movet et flectit; idque non tantum metaphorico causandi modo,* et actione quam *moralem* vocant Scholastici,* per modum* finis,* ut loquuntur, proposita objecti bonitate et convenientia; per intellectum illuminatum, et practicum suum judicium ultimum proponentem, quod voluntas* necessario sequatur: sed etiam per actionem suam immediate* voluntatem* afficientem, et in motum ejusdem et actum* influentem, dum (ut Aug. verbis utar, lib. *De grat. Christi*, cap. 24.)[a] *interna atque occulta, mirabili atque ineffabili potestate, operatur in cordibus hominum, non solum veras revelationes, sed etiam bonas voluntates*.* Quae certe verba realem et propriam efficientiam indicant. Hinc peculiari

[a] Augustine, *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali* 24 (CSEL 42:145).

to compose one soul.[12] Like the vegetative and sensitive soul in a human being, in the person who has been justified historical faith and faith in miracles constitute a particular arrangement, because they are reckoned by justifying faith and are fulfilled by it. The difference lies in the fact that the rational soul necessarily depends upon the vegetative and sensitive soul. But justifying faith, although it is always connected to the historical one, can still be separated from the faith in miracles.

The main efficient cause* of this faith[13] is God the Father in the Son through 9
the Holy Spirit who enlightens the mind and moves or bends the will* which otherwise is turned away from God. God moves the mind not only in some metaphorical way* of causation, or by an action that the Scholastics* call 'moral,' 'by way* of an end'* (as they call it), when the good and suitable quality of an object is presented and when the enlightened intellect advances its own final judgment, which the will* necessarily follows.[14] But God does so also through his own action that immediately* affects the will* and influences it into its movement and action,* while—to use the words of Augustine in chapter 24 of his book on the grace of Christ—[the Holy Spirit] "by his internal, secret, wondrous and inexpressible power effects in people's hearts not only true revelations but also good actions of the will."* These words certainly show a real, proper efficiency.[15] Hence, in a special way, faith is called a gift of God, and

12 According to Aristotle, a plant has only a vegetative soul, an animal has one soul that is both vegetative and sensitive, while a human being has one soul that is vegetative, sensitive and rational.

13 *Causa efficiens princeps*: "The efficient cause, or productive, effective cause, which is the agent productive of the motion or mutation in any sequence of causes and effects" *DLGTT* s.v. "causa."

14 The distinction is between what usually is called a 'physical predetermination or promotion,' that is a direct, efficacious movement of the human will by God, and a 'moral' one, in which God, by way of final causality, persuades and elicits the human will to assent to a good.

15 Whether God moves the human will directly and efficaciously or only through moral persuasion, was a controversial issue in Roman Catholic theology, in particular between the Dominican Bañez and the Jesuit Molina. But here Rivetus probably attacks the view of the Saumur theologian John Cameron. In his *Praelectio ad Philipp. Cap. 11. Vers. 12. 13* and *Theses de gratia et libero arbitrio* (esp. thesis 10) of 1618, Cameron had insisted that the will necessarily follows the intellect in conversion, and characterized the efficacy of God's work as 'persuasion,' insisting that it was 'moral'—rather than 'physical'—in nature; see John Cameron, *Τα Σωζομενα sive Opera partim ab auctore ipso edita, partim post eius obitum vulgata, partim nusquam hactenus publicata, vel à Gallico idiomate nunc primùm in Latinam linguam translata* (Geneva: Pierre Chouet, 1659), 343a–344b, 332a. Cameron denied a divine *immediate* operation on the will in conversion. Rivetus wrote to Cameron

ratione fides dicitur donum Dei, et ejus auctor Spiritus, Spiritus fidei, 1 Cor. 12, 9. et 2 Cor. 4, 13. Act. 16, 14. Phil. 1, 29. Col. 2, 12. Heb. 12, 2.

x Haec operandi ratio eorum arguit ingratam impietatem, qui cum Socino sentiunt, causam* fidei justificantis efficientem esse hominem ipsum, qui virtute sua naturali* et libero arbitrio,* verbum Dei ipsi propositum, vel acceptat, vel respuit, nec aliter censent fidem esse Dei donum, quam generale eo modo quo quaelibet res* bona Dei donum dici potest. Quam Pelagii redivivi sententiam interpolarunt et incrustarunt, eodem tamen incommodo manente, qui in donatione fidei, gratiae* quidem aliquid tribuunt et divinae illuminationi, etiam per spiritum interius operantem: in eo tamen consentiunt, quod omnibus praerequisitis ex parte Dei positis, ad ingenerandam et eliciendam fidem, in potestate hominis manet ut operatio Dei sit efficax aut contra, quia homo a Deo motus, potest* non moveri, ex eorum hypothesi, et positis omnibus praerequisitis agere et non agere; ac proinde secundum eos, Deus non est propria et immediata* fidei causa,* cujus alioquin operationibus omnibus positis, effectum semper sequeretur, vel potius simul exsisteret. Redarguitur eorum qui sic sentiunt, error, Phil. 1, 29. et 2, 13. Eph. 1, 18. et 19. Col. 2, 13. 2 Thess. 1, 11. 2 Pet. 1, 3.

xi Causa* minus principalis seu instrumentalis fidei ordinaria, *est verbum fidei quod praedicatur, cum prope est in ore nostro et in corde nostro*, Rom. 10, 8. Nascitur enim fides *ex auditu verbi Dei*, ibid. vers. 17. praesertim Evangelici, quia verbum* Legis est tantum ad fidem justificantem praeparatorium. *Evangelium autem est potentia Dei ad salutem omni credenti*, Rom. 1, 16. Huic verbo adduntur *signa* quaedam, vel extraordinaria, vel ordinaria. Extraordinaria, ut *miracula*; ordinaria, ut *Sacramenta*,* quae ad fidem ingenerandam faciunt, eandemque genitam alendam, fovendam et augendam; quibus tamen semper verbum* praeire necesse est, idque ejusmodi de cujus divina veritate non dubitetur. Quod nullum hoc tempore extra Scripturas divinitus inspiratas agnoscimus; ac proinde eorum rejicimus sacrilegium, qui non minorem fidem adhibere se profitentur traditionibus non scriptis, decretis Pontificum, Conciliorum

---

on behalf of his Leiden colleagues, demanding that he explicitly admit not only a 'moral' but also a 'real and proper' divine causality on the will (letter dated 31.1.1622, in Cameron, *Opera* 709a–b). In the eyes of his opponents, Cameron's view betrayed an overly positive anthropology and was out of line with the *Canons of Dort*, which insist that God works on both intellect and will (III/IV, 10, 11). See Gootjes, *Claude Pajon*, 37–43, 152–161. In the controversies over the 'Saumur theology,' which broke out c. 1634, Rivetus was forced once more to attack the Cameronian view on conversion as defended by the respondent Testard and by Moïse Amyraut (1596–1664)—with some differences between them—in their respective writings (Gootjes, *Claude Pajon*, esp. 43–45, 56–58, 73–75).

the author, the Holy Spirit, is called "the Spirit of faith" (1 Corinthians 12:9 and 2 Corinthians 4:13; Acts 16:14; Philippians 1:29; Colossians 2:12; Hebrews 12:2).

This account of the way it works exposes the ingratitude and godlessness 10
of those who share the opinion of Socinus, namely, that the efficient cause* of justifying faith is man himself, man who of his own natural* power and free choice* either accepts or rejects the word of God that is declared to him.[16] And they are of the opinion also that faith is a gift of God no differently than any good thing* whatsoever can be called a gift of God in that general way. They have refurbished and patched up a recycled idea of Pelagius; and yet this same inconvenience remains: though they attribute some small amount to grace* and divine enlightenment when faith is bestowed (even through the Spirit working inwardly), yet they concur [with Pelagius] that after everything has been provided that is required on God's part for ingenerating and eliciting faith, whether or not the working of God is efficient still remains within the power of man, because while man is moved by God he also is able* to not be moved (according to their way of thinking), and after all the necessary things have been put in place, man is able to act or not to act. And so according to them God is not the proper and immediate* cause* of faith, because otherwise, God's effect would always follow (or better, would always come about at the same time) if all his acts were performed.[17] Philippians 1:29 and 2:13, Ephesians 1:18–19, Colossians 2:13, 2 Thessalonians 1:11, and 2 Peter 1:3 prove the error of those who think in this way.

A less principal cause,* or the ordinary instrumental cause of faith is "the 11
word of faith that is preached, the word that is nearby, in our mouth and in our hearts" (Romans 10:8). For faith comes about from "hearing the word of God" (Romans 10:17), and especially from hearing the word of the Gospel, since the word* of the Law only prepares the way for justifying faith. Moreover, "the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation for all who believe" (Romans 1:16). And to this word* certain signs are added, signs that are either ordinary or extraordinary. Extraordinary signs, like miracles, and ordinary signs like the sacraments* contribute to the implanting of faith and to nurturing, fostering, and increasing it once it has been brought forth. But the word must always precede the signs, and we should also not doubt that it is the divine truth. And in this [our] era we do not accept as valid any word other than the divinely inspired Scriptures; accordingly, we reject as sacrilegious those people who profess to apply an equal amount of faith in the unwritten traditions (the papal

16 On the Socinian opinion regarding free choice see *RC*, 325.

17 In other words, according to the Socinians, God's activity is a necessary but not sufficient condition for faith.

sanctionibus, et rationum* momentis, quam scripto Dei verbo, et in utrisque *parem pietatis affectum** requirunt.

XII Etsi autem verbo Dei audito, libenter cum Scriptura tribuamus, quod *virtus Dei sit iis qui salvi fiunt*, quod idem sit *semen* cordibus immissum, quod sit *anceps gladius*, penetrans animam, 1 Cor. 1, 18. Luc. 8, 11. Heb. 4, 12., non tamen iis assentimur, qui externae Evangelii praedicationi, quatenus aures ferit, hanc vim attribuunt, ut proprie et velut ex opere operato fidem ingeneret, eidemque spiritus operatio includatur. Etsi enim necessitate praecepti sit adultis necessaria et praerequisita; ejus tamen externa actio sine Spiritus intus Evangelii sensum revelantis, et cordis auribus proponentis et obsignantis efficacia, ad fidem non sufficeret. *Neque enim qui plantat, est aliquid, neque qui rigat, sed qui incrementum dat Deus*, 1 Cor. 3, 7. Hic igitur est observandum ne in extrema praecipites eamus, et conjungenda divellamus, vel distinguenda confundamus, instrumento quod est primariae causae* proprie* tribuendo, et sensu eodem; vel etiam Spiritum extra verbum quaerendo; aut verbi intelligentiam, et ex verbo intellecto assensum et veram fiduciam, sine Spiritus interna revelatione, ex verbo ipso, aut Ministerio ejusdem, et intellectus nostri luce, exspectando.

XIII Materia fidei consideratur, vel in subjectis* suis, vel in objectis. Subjectum commune* fidei est hominis anima, quae sola est subjectum δεκτικὸν talis vir-

decrees, the sanctions of the councils, and the indwelling forces of reasoning*) as in the written Word of God, and who demand "the same attitude* of piety" towards them both.[18]

Along with Scripture itself we willingly grant that when one hears the Word 12
of God it is "the power of God for those who are being saved" (1 Corinthians 1:18), that it "is the seed that has been sown in our hearts" (Luke 8:11), and that it "is a two-edged sword piercing the soul" (Hebrews 4:12). Nevertheless, we disagree with those who ascribe a power of the following sort to the outward preaching of the Gospel as it strikes the ears: that ingenerating faith is a property inherent in the preaching, as though the very performance of that action achieves it, and as though the operation of the Holy Spirit is bound up in it.[19] Even though by [God's] command the outward preaching is a necessary prerequisite of faith for adults, nevertheless the outward act of the preaching is not sufficient for faith if it is not accompanied by the efficacy of the Holy Spirit as he reveals the meaning of the Gospel inwardly and as he presents and seals it upon the 'ears' of the heart. For "neither he who plants is anything, nor is he who waters, but he who grants the increase—God" (1 Corinthians 3:7). We must therefore see to it here that we not go head over heels to the extremes and pull apart what belongs together, or mix up what should be kept apart, by attributing to the instrument what belongs properly* to the primary cause,* and with the same sense. Nor should we do so by looking for the Spirit apart from the Word, or by looking for an understanding of the Word apart from the internal revelation by the Spirit; or, once the Word is understood, by looking for the assent and true confidence from the Word itself (or from the one who administers it) apart from the internal revelation by the Spirit, and to do so by the light of our understanding.

One considers the matter of faith in its subjects* or its objects. The general* 13
subject of faith is the soul of man, as only it is a subject capable of receiving

18 Quotation from the Council of Trent, DH 1501. On the unwritten traditions see *SPT* 4.3–5.

19 Rivetus refers to the position of the Lutherans who held that the *verbum externum* as such was intrinsically efficacious. The distinction between the Lutheran and Reformed positions is generally summarized as *per verbum* versus *cum verbo*. The immediate background here may be the so called 'Rahtmann controversy' occasioned by the publication of a Lutheran pastor in Danzig, Hermann Rahtmann, who claimed that the outward Word was without effect unless the Holy Spirit additionally penetrates into the heart. The main work in which he made his point *Jesu Christi, des Königs aller Könige und Herrn aller Herren Gnadenreich* (Danzig: Andreas Hünefeldt, 1621) immediately evoked the opposite reactions from Lutheran theologians. On the issue and on the Lutheran reactions see Kenneth G. Appold, *Abraham Calov's doctrine of* vocatio *in its systematic context* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 112–124.

tutis. Et fidei quidem, quatenus est ex auditu verbi,* et actu* credit, adultorum electorum tantum; quatenus autem pro habitus* principio* sumitur, aut semine fidei, infantium etiam foederatorum qui ad electionem divinam pertinent; quorum ut est *regnum coelorum*, sic etiam ad eos pertinet spiritus fidei, Matt. 19, 14. Etsi ergo actu* non credant, dicuntur tamen credere inclinatione per gratiam, sicut ad peccatum habent inclinationem per naturam.

XIV Proprium autem et speciale subjectum* fidei justificantis in homine, est non solum intellectus, sed etiam voluntas.* Notitia enim et assensus ad intellectum pertinent: fiducia autem ad voluntatem. Nec ad justificationem sufficit ut intellectus comprehendat, quae Dei sunt, nisi voluntas eadem apprehendat et amplectatur, non solum in thesi, sed etiam in hypothesi. Scriptura tamen aliquando ita de fide loquitur, ut magis ad notitiam et assensum respiciat, interdum magis ad fiduciam. Sed quemadmodum verba notitiae apud Hebraeos, saepe denotant affectum* cordis: sic non mirandum est, si cognitio et assensus fidei synecdochice* fiduciam etiam conjunctam connotent. Quae cum sola ponitur, assensum etiam et notitiam supponit, quia ignoti nulla cupido.

XV Non obstat, quod nonnulli impossibile censent, idque tamquam invictum argumentum objiciunt, unam et eandem numero qualitatem* diversis inesse subjectis,* vel unam et eandem virtutem in duabus esse potentiis* genere distinctis. Nam praeter id quod inter Scholasticos* non convenit, tales esse potentias* intellectum et voluntatem,* id negante Durando cum suis sectatoribus, in 1 Sent. dist. 3. q. 4.[a] qui easdem reipsa distinctas esse contendunt, faten-

[a] Durand of St. Pourçain, *In Sententias theologicas Petri Lombardi commentariorum* (Lyon: Gulielmus Rouillius, 1563), fol. 22$^{ra–vb}$.

something so worthy. And insofar as faith comes by hearing the Word* and insofar as the soul actually* believes it, the subjects of faith are only the souls of the elect who are adults. But insofar as faith is taken to mean the beginning* of the disposition* of faith or as the 'seed' of faith,[20] it has as its subject also the souls of those infant members of the covenant who have a share in the divine election. For just as "the kingdom of heaven" belongs to them, so too does the spirit of faith (Matthew 19:14). And so even though they do not actually* believe, we say that infants believe by being so inclined through grace, just as they are inclined by nature* to sin.

14 However, the proper and special subject* of justifying faith in a person, is not only the intellect, but also the will.* For while knowledge and assent belong to the intellect, confidence belongs to the will. Nor is it enough for justification that the intellect grasps the things that are of God, but also that the will takes hold of them and embraces them, not only in *thesis* but also in *hypothesis*.[21] Moreover, Scripture sometimes speaks about faith in such a way that it is more related to knowledge and assent at one time, and to confidence at another time. But just as in Hebrew the words for knowledge often denote the feelings* of the heart, so too it shouldn't amaze us if by synecdoche*[22] the knowledge and assent of faith connote also the confidence that is adjacent to it. And whenever confidence is expressed by itself, assent and knowledge are also assumed, because there is no such thing as a longing for what is not known.

15 The fact that a quality* which is one and the same in number exists in different subjects* is not an obstacle, nor the fact that one and the same virtue exists in two different kinds of powers,*[23] though some people do consider it impossible and raise it as an objection. For besides the fact that the Schoolmen* are not agreed that the intellect and the will* are different kind of powers* (Durand and his followers deny it, *Commentary on the Sentences*, book 1, distinction 3,

20 On this concept see Otto Gründler, "From Seed to Fruition: Calvin's Notion of the *semen fidei* and Its Aftermath in Reformed Orthodoxy," in *Probing the Reformed Tradition: Historical Essays in Honor of Edward A. Dowey Jr.*, ed. Elsie Anne McKee and Brian G. Armstrong (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1989), 108–115.

21 "In *thesis*" means "in general" or "in theory." "In *hypothesis*" means "in this specific case" or "actually." Here, it means the same as the distinction between "general" and "particular confidence" in thesis 6 above.

22 See *SPT* 24.46.

23 The question if one virtue (i.e. a good habit) can have as its seat or subject different powers of the soul, e.g., the intellect and the will, was a common one in medieval scholasticism. See, e.g., Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 1/2.56.2. Faith was considered one of the three theological virtues.

tur: *actum* credendi et a voluntate et ab intellectu procedere, quorum utrumque natum est per habitum* perfici, et ideo oportere tam in voluntate quam in intellectu esse aliquem habitum,* si debet actus fidei esse perfectus*. Thom. 1. 2. q. 66. art. 4.[a]

XVI Nos autem dicimus, fidem quidem, quatenus est justificans, non esse habitum* unum numero simplicem absolute,* sed esse unum habitum aggregatione, et quodammodo compositum ex duobus, qui coordinatione tantum unum sunt, nempe quatenus fides simul involvit habitum exsistentem in voluntate,* quo voluntas prompta fit ad credendum et confidendum Deo, quomodo duo habitus possunt* esse una virtus, et duae res* unus actus,* et multae scientiae* dicunt habitum, tantum coordinatione unum, qui tamen ratione diversarum potentiarum* non est unus simplex habitus, aut una qualitas,* sed plures. Id agnoscit ipse Suarez disp. 44. de habitibus, sect. 55. et 57.[b] nempe praeter unitatem indivisibilem, quam habent aliqui habitus, per simplices qualitates, dari in aliquibus unitatem compositam per collectionem et subordinationem plurium qualitatum,* alioqui non posse* salvari modum loquendi de unitate Scientiarum, ut verbi gratia, Geometriam non tantum genere, sed etiam specie* unam esse scientiam. Quod etiam in genere qualitatis* verum esse, in dispositionibus corporis ostendit, quia sanitas et pulchritudo, quae in communi modo

[a] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 2/2.4.2. The reference to *Summa theologiae* 1/2.66.4 does not seem to make sense. [b] Francisco Suárez, *Disputationes metaphysicae* 44, section 55 and 57, in: *Opera omnia* (Paris: Vives, 1856–1878), 26:711–712.

chapter 4),[24] people who maintain that they are in fact distinct admit that "the act* of believing arises from the will as well as the intellect, both of which are designed to be completed by a disposition, and so there must be some disposition* in the will as well as in the intellect, for the act of faith to be complete" (Thomas Aquinas* [*Summa theologiae*] 2/2, question 4, article 2).

But we do state that certainly faith, insofar as it is justifying faith, is not one 16
single and absolutely* simple disposition,* but it is an aggregate (or combined) disposition that somehow is composed of two dispositions that form only one when they are coordinated. That is to say, faith is composite because it involves a disposition that is present simultaneously in the will* [besides the intellect]—a disposition whereby the will is made ready to believe and to have confidence in God in the same way that two dispositions can* form one virtue and two things* can combine into one act.* So also many sciences* are called a disposition that is only one by coordination, even though each is not a simple disposition or a single quality,* but many, because of the diverse powers.* Suárez himself admits as much (*On Dispositions*, disputation 44, section 55 and 57),[25] namely that besides the indivisible unity that some dispositions possess because they have a simple quality,* a composite unity is granted for other dispositions by the fact that qualities are gathered together in a relative arrangement—otherwise one cannot* maintain the way we speak about the unity of the sciences. For, to use an example, geometry is a single science not only as *genus* but also as *species*.*[26] The arrangements in the human body show that this holds true also for the category of quality,*[27] because in the

24 Durandus of St. Pourçain (c. 1275–1334), French Dominican theologian and bishop. In his early works he followed and defended Thomas Aquinas, but later developed his own independent views adopting a nominalist position which came in some respects closer to Duns Scotus. His works, together with those of Gregory of Rimini, became textbooks of leading nominalist chairs in theology.

25 Francisco Suárez (1548–1617), Jesuit theologian and the most influential representative of Spanish scholasticism. He was a prolific writer in theology, philosophy and law. He claimed to follow the thought of Thomas Aquinas, but often gave his own, more Scotist interpretation of it. During his life he had some problems with the Inquisition, but after his death Suárez became one of the most renowned theologians in the Roman Catholic Church. The *Disputationes metaphysicae* are his main work. Suárez mentions geometry and the corporeal qualities as examples of composed unities.

26 In early modernity, 'geometry' included also optics, astronomy and mechanics. Cf. Zvi Biener, "The Unity of Science in Early-modern Philosophy: Subalternation, Metaphysics and the Geometrical Manner in Scholasticism, Galileo and Descartes" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 2008), 7.

27 'Quality' is the third of Aristotle's categories, after 'substance' and 'quantity.' See Glossary.

loquendi una qualitas* censentur, sunt tamen ex proportione plurium resultantes. Sic unam liberalitatem conflari ex habitu voluntatis* et appetitus sensitivi, vel *unam virtutem fidei, ex habitu intellectus, et piae affectionis voluntatis*,[a] non tamen simpliciter dici sub nomine* habitus,* idque esse in utraque potentia,* sed nomen specificum (exempli gratia nomen fidei) saepe magis admittere et significare* illam compositionem, quam genericum.

XVII Non igitur, quod ex adversariis volunt nonnulli, *triformem Chimaeram*[b] introducunt, qui in fide salvifica talem compositionem admittunt, et unius fidei per aggregationem, tres veluti partes constituunt, notitiam nempe et assensum in intellectu, et fiduciam in voluntate;* cum nihil sit in Scriptura magis obvium, quam notitiam esse partem fidei, quae vocatur scientia* salutis, Luc. 1, 77. *Scientia*,* qua *Messias multos justificat*, Esa. 53, 11. et vita aeterna in cognitione Dei et Christi quem misit, collocetur, Joh. 17, 3. quae alibi dicitur *agnitio voluntatis Dei in omni sapientia et intelligentia spirituali*, Col. 1, 9. Falsum est igitur quod Bellarminus asseruit, Lib. 1. *De Justif*. c. 7.[c] *Fidem ita distingui contra scientiam,* ut*

[a] Suárez, *Disputationes metaphysicae* 44.57 (*Opera* 26:712).

[b] See also Homer, *Iliad* VI.181.

[c] Bellarmine, *De iustificatione* 1.7 (*Opera* 6:160a).

usual manner of speaking health and physical beauty are considered to be single qualities,* notwithstanding the fact that each of them is the result of the inter-relationships of many qualities.* In the same way [we state] that the one generosity is a combination of a disposition of the will* and a disposition of the sensory appetite[28] or that this "one virtue of faith coming from a disposition of the intellect and a disposition of the devout inclination of the will" nevertheless is not called with the name* 'disposition'* in a simple way; [and we say] that the one [virtue] exists in both powers,* but that a specific name (e.g., 'faith') allows and denotes* that composition more often than a generic name does.[29]

And so those people who grant such composition in saving faith and who 17
from the one faith make up as it were three parts through aggregation (namely knowledge and assent in the intellect, and confidence in the will*) are not letting in a triple-bodied Chimaera, as some of their opponents would have it.[30] For in Scripture nothing is more obvious than that knowledge is a part of faith, as it is called "the knowledge* of salvation" (Luke 1:77), and "the knowledge* whereby the Messiah will justify many" (Isaiah 53:11); "life eternal resides in the knowledge of God and of the Christ whom He has sent" (John 17:3). And elsewhere it is called "the knowledge of the will of God in all spiritual wisdom and understanding" (Colossians 1:9). Therefore it is wrong of Bellarmine to claim "that faith is so distinct from science* that one should define it in terms of ignorance rather than knowledge" (*On Justification*, book 1, chapter 7).[31] We

28 Scholastics distinguish between the intellectual appetite or will (directed at the good in general) and the sensory appetite (directed at what the senses present as good).

29 The argument is that although the term 'faith' specifically signifies a disposition of the power of the intellect (like also 'knowledge,' 'wisdom,' 'opinion'), yet it can often also signify a combination of an intellectual disposition and a disposition of an affection of the will. When a science, a quality or a disposition is composed of several elements, there can be a 'generic' name for it, as the examples of 'geometry' and 'health' show. But more often there is not such a generic name, and the word for one of the elements is used for signifying the composition. This is the case with the word 'faith.' Rivetus suggests that this is a common linguistic phenomenon.

30 According to Greek mythology the Chimaera was a triple-bodied monster composed of a lion, a serpent, and a goat. Some Protestant scholars have identified the Roman Catholic theologian Albert Pighius (1490–1542) as the source of this criticism against the threefold definition of faith defended by Rivetus: Martin Chemnitz, *Examination of the Council of Trent*, trans. Fred Kramer (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1971), 1:578 and Johann Andreas Quenstedt, *Theologia didactico-polemica sive Systema theologicum* (Wittenberg: Quenstedius, 1691), 4:291. However, we have not been able to locate the criticism in Pighius's work.

31 'Science' is used here in the Aristotelian sense of the word and it means full, certain, and demonstrative knowledge of a thing and its causes.

melius per ignorantiam, quam per notitiam definiatur. Non certe quod dicamus fidem esse scientiam, quae omnes causas* et proprietates sui objecti rationis* lumine attingat et evidentiam* rei* sequatur; sed hoc volumus, ad eam necessariam esse intelligentiam, qua cognoscimus id quod credendum nobis proponitur, cognitione ὅτι; idemque etsi captum nostrum superet, solido verbi divini fundamento* inniti, ejusque per se majorem esse certitudinem, quam reliquarum virtutum intellectualium quae rationi* humanae innituntur.

XVIII Assensum ad fidem necessarium esse, quia in controversia positum non est, argumentis probare* supersedebo. Sed quia negant adversarii, cum assensu eandem etiam complecti *fiduciam*, id multis modis ex Scriptura probatur.* Non solum ab Etymologia, quia πίστις et πεποίθησις unam et eandem habent originem, et conjugata πιστεύειν et πιστὸς, confidere et fidelem, i. eum cui aliquis fidit, significant,* Matt. 24, 23. Luc. 16, 11., quod praeterea fides in Scriptura iis nominibus* indigitatur, quae necessario fiduciam connotant; dicitur enim πληροφορία, Rom. 4, 21. κατάληψις, Phil. 3, 12. λῆψις Χριστοῦ, Joh. 1, 12. θάρσος, Joh. 16, 33. Matt. 9, 22. παρρησία, Eph. 3, 12. Hebr. 3, 6. καύχησις, Rom. 5, 2. etc. ὑπόστασις βεβαία, Hebr. 3, 14. Sed praeterea, quia tam in V. quam in N. T. saepe indifferenter ponuntur verba* confidendi et credendi, fidei et fiduciae. Quod enim Ps. 2 effertur per τὸ *confidere, Beati omnes qui confidunt in eo*, Marc. 16, 16. redditur per τὸ credere, *Qui crediderit, salvus erit*. Quod Prov. 3, 5. dicitur, *Confide Domino in corde tuo*, id Paulus Rom. 10, 10. exponit, *corde creditur ad justitiam*. Ps. 78, 22. *Non crediderunt in eum, nec confisi sunt in salute*, ubi fides ἐξηγητικῶς per fiduciam exponitur. Item ex oppositione res elucescit, fiduciae enim opponitur metus vel dubitatio, at metus etiam opponitur actui* credendi, Marc. 5, 36. *Ne metuas, tantum crede*. Luc. 8, 50. *Ne timeas, solummodo crede*. Cum igitur fides et fiducia unum habeant oppositum, inter se unum et idem esse necesse est. *Rectissime igitur* (verba sunt Jansenii Harmon. Evang. 32.)[a] *nomen* fidei in Evangeliis cum ei tribuitur salus aut consecutio omnium quae volumus complecti,*

[a] Cornelius Jansen, *Commentariorum in suam concordiam, ac totam historiam evangelicam epitome* (Antwerp: Beller, 1593), 171.

would certainly not say that faith is a science which arrives at all the causes* and properties of its object by the light of reason* and which follows upon the object's* manifest evidence.* But what we mean is that understanding is necessary for faith, and by it we come to know that which is proposed for us to believe, in the form of knowing 'that it is so.'[32] And we mean also that this understanding relies on the firm foundation* of the divine Word (even though it surpasses our grasp), and that its certainty is by itself greater than the other intellectual virtues that rely on human reason.*

I shall refrain from proving* by means of arguments that assent is necessary 18
for faith, because this is not considered a matter of debate. But because our opponents deny that faith, besides assent, includes confidence, we show* it from Scripture in many ways. Not only by etymology—i.e., because 'faith' (*pistis*) and 'confidence' (*pepoithēsis*) have one and the same root, and because the etymologically related words *pisteuein* and *pistos* mean* 'to have faith' and 'trustworthy'—used of the one in whom someone else has faith (Matthew 24:23 [and 26], Luke 16:11). But also, in Scripture faith is mentioned with those words* that necessarily imply confidence: 'full assurance' (Romans 4.21), 'grasping' (Philippians 3:12), 'receiving Christ' (John 1:12), 'courage' (John 16:33, Matthew 9:22), 'frankness' (Ephesians 3:12, Hebrews 3:6), 'boasting' (Romans 5:2, etc.), 'the firm foundation' (Hebrews 3:14). But what is more, it is because in the Old as well as in the New Testament the verbs* 'to have confidence' and 'to believe' are used interchangeably, just as with 'faith' and 'confidence.' For what is expressed by "to have confidence" in Psalm 2[:12]—"blessed are all who have confidence in him"—is rendered in Mark 16:16 by "to believe"—"whoever believes will be saved." And the statement "have confidence in the Lord in your heart" in Proverbs 3:5 is explained by Paul in Romans 10:10 as "with the heart one believes unto righteousness." In Psalm 78:22, [where it says] "they did not believe in him, nor did they have confidence in his salvation," 'faith' is expressed exegetically by 'confidence.' And the matter becomes clear also from what is its opposite etymologically, for placed over against confidence is fear, or doubt; but fear is placed also over against the act* of believing, as in Mark 5:36: "Do not fear, only believe;" and in Luke 8:50: "Do not be afraid, but only believe." Therefore since faith and confidence share a single opposite, it must be that they are one and the same. "Therefore in the Gospels the word* 'faith,' when salvation or the pursuit of everything that we desire, is attributed to it, is used for both, namely

32 In Aristotle's epistemology, "knowing *that* it is so" concerns merely factual knowledge. It differs from the demonstrative insight that results from "knowing *why* it is so."

dicit utrumque, nempe assensum illum firmum in credendis de Deo et Christo, et fiduciam ex illius omnipotente bonitate conceptam.

XIX Objectum fidei duplex est, *materiale et formale*. Materiale vocant, id de quo agitur, id est, id quod creditur. Formale autem id quod efficit ut materiale actu* et reipsa objiciatur potentiae,* quomodo lumen est objectum in visu, medium in scientiis.* Fidei igitur materiale objectum, sunt res* omnes quae credendae a Deo hominibus proponuntur, Deus ipse et omnia ad Deum pertinentia. Sed Deus, quatenus nobis occurrit in Christo, *qui est invisibilis Dei imago*, Col. 1, 15. alioqui non posset* in salutem Deus nobis innotescere. Et fides omnis paulatim evanesceret, nisi Christus intercederet medius, qui eam in solida veritate retinet, quia alioquin altior est Dei majestas quam ut ad eam penetrent mortales. Quamvis ergo *fides* in sua latitudine sumpta, ut complectitur supernaturalem* notitiam, assensum et fiduciam, quaecunque in Dei verbo tamquam ad salutem conducentia nobis sunt revelata, complectatur; est tamen quoddam fidei objectum speciale, quatenus est justificans. In generali illo objecto fidei, non aequaliter ponimus omnia quae in Scripturis habentur; sed distinguimus inter ea quae directe et per se ad fidem pertinent, et ea quae eandem certo ordine et reductione spectant, et per accidens* et secundario se habent ad objectum fidei, ut sunt historicae quaedam descriptiones de rebus* particularibus, quae in se articulos fidei non constituunt, in quibus locum habet fides quam implicitam vocant, non autem in articulis ad salutem per se et univoce necessariis.

that firm assent in the things that we must believe about God and Christ, and also the confidence that is received out of God's almighty goodness" (the words are taken from Jansen, *The Harmony of the Gospels*, chapter 32).[33]

Faith has two objects, a material and a formal one.[34] The material object 19
is the name given to whatever faith is concerned about, whatever is being believed. And the formal object is the one which brings it about that the material object is indeed actually* made available to the power* [of the soul], in the same way that light is the formal object in seeing, and in the sciences* the formal object is the medium.[35] The material object of faith is everything* that God presents to mankind as needing to be believed—God himself and all that pertains to God. That is to say, God insofar as He comes to us in Christ "who is the image of the invisible God" (Colossians 1:15), because there is no other way whereby God could* become known to us for our salvation. And all faith would have disappeared little by little, had not Christ intervened as Mediator, for he keeps faith firmly grounded in the truth, because otherwise it would be far beyond the reach of mortals to enter upon the majesty of God. Therefore although faith, taken in the broad sense of including supernatural* knowledge, assent and confidence, embraces whatever is revealed in God's Word as conducive to our salvation, yet there is a certain special object of faith insofar as it justifies us. In general, we do not consider everything that Scripture contains as being equally relevant to that special object of faith, but we distinguish between things that are inherently and directly relevant to faith, and things that with a view to faith are accidental* to it and are at some remove from it, things that occupy indirectly a secondary place in relation to the object of faith. Things of this sort include some of the narrative descriptions of particular matters,* matters that of themselves do not constitute articles of the faith. They are things in which what some call 'implicit faith' is said to have a place—albeit not in the articles that of themselves are explicitly,

33 Cornelius Jansen (or Jansenius) the Elder (1510–1576) was a Flemish Roman Catholic biblical scholar and bishop of Ghent. He participated in the Council of Trent as a representative of the University of Louvain and was involved in publishing the Council's decree. He was an expert in ancient oriental languages and focused on the literal meaning of the biblical text. He is not to be confused with his famous namesake, the father of Jansenism.

34 On the distinction between the material and the formal object of faith see thesis 2 above, note 3.

35 Light is the formal object in the power of sight, because it makes things visible. In demonstrative, scientific knowledge, the means or 'middle term' in a demonstrative syllogism, is what makes the conclusion (the material object) known. Likewise, God as revealing is the formal object of faith; see also thesis 24 below.

Sic Paulum habuisse *penulam*, et similia ad fidem tantum pertinent, quae est in praeparatione animi, parati credere tamquam verum, quicquid Scriptura Sacra continet.

XX Fidei quatenus est justificans speciale objectum, et quod eam proprie* a reliquis fidei acceptionibus discriminat, est promissio Evangelica de Christo Mediatore, eatenus enim proprie* justificat, et salvat, quatenus Christi meritum in verbo* Evangelii sibi revelatum, apprehendit et amplectitur; non enim sufficit, si quis rei gestae historiam, nempe quod Christus passus est, norit; nec etiam si quis assentiatur et credat, Christum esse passum pro peccatis omnium hominum; sed insuper requiritur, ut accedat πληροφορία et fiducia certa, qua firmissime peccator credat, non solum aliis credentibus, sed sibi quoque privatim remissionem peccatorum propter Christi meritum donatam esse, et propter ejusdem satisfactionem in gratiam* esse receptum, idque sibi fiducialiter applicet. Hinc est quod Joh. 1, 12. per τὸ λαβεῖν describitur, quod nudae notitiae et assensui non competit. *Christo* autem *omnes Prophetae testimonium dant, remissionem peccatorum accepturos per nomen ejus omnes qui credunt in eum*, Act. 10, 43. Igitur qui credunt, nisi Dei testimonium* rejicere velint, de peccatorum suorum remissione et sua per Christum reconciliatione certi esse debent.

XXI Nec vacillat hujus specialis fidei certitudo, etsi mihi aut illi in particulari, in verbo* Dei, nusquam reperiatur annunciata salus; quemadmodum non dubia est certitudo convictionis qua lex moralis unumquemque hominem maledictionis reum facit. Nam etsi neminem in specie* nominet, quisque tamen ex proprio peccati sensu, infert necessariam conclusionem. Similis est ratio in iis qui fide donati, ex eo quod, *Omnem qui credit in Filium, habiturum vitam aeternam*, asserit Scriptura, Joh. 3, 16. et *remissionem peccatorum accepturos omnes qui in eum credunt*, sub hac universali subsumunt, se accepisse remissionem

unambiguously necessary for salvation.[36] Thus the fact that Paul had a cloak,[37] and other similar facts, is only of relevance to the kind of faith that prepares the soul or makes it ready to believe the truth of anything contained in Holy Scripture.

To the extent that it justifies, faith has a special object, one that gives it a 20
proper* distinction from the other meanings of faith. And that special object is the gospel-promise of Christ as the Mediator, for that [faith] strictly* speaking is what justifies and saves, because it takes hold of and embraces Christ's merit as having been revealed to it in the word* of the Gospel. For it is not enough for someone to know the history of what took place (i.e., the fact that Christ suffered); nor is it even enough if someone agrees with and believes that Christ suffered for the sins of all mankind. But over and above these things it is necessary that there be full assurance[38] and confidence wherein the sinner believes most steadfastly that the forgiveness of sins which Christ has merited has been granted not only to other believers but also to himself in particular, and that he has been received into grace* through the satisfaction obtained by Christ, and so he moreover applies it to himself with confidence. This is what John 1:12 expresses with the word "to receive," an expression that is not suitable to mere knowledge and assent. For "all the prophets testify about Christ that all who believe in him will receive forgiveness of sins through his name" (Acts 10:43). Therefore those who believe, unless they wish to reject God's testimony,* must be certain that their own sins have been forgiven and that they have been reconciled through Christ.

And the certainty of this special faith does not suffer from any doubt, even 21
though in the Word* of God it does not happen that salvation is declared to me personally (or to any one else in particular). It is similar to the certainty of being convicted by the moral Law that makes each and every human being guilty of the curse: there is no doubt in that certainty. For, although it names no-one in particular,* yet everyone draws the necessary conclusion from his own sense of sin. And the same happens to those who have been granted faith: from the general assertion made in Scripture that "everyone who believes in the Son shall have eternal life" (John 3:16) and that "forgiveness of sins will be granted to all who believe in him" they draw the conclusion that because they

36 Rivetus takes 'implicit faith' in the sense of 'preparing to faith' and not in the particular Scholastic sense of a not fully articulated content of faith that may still be salvific. Cf. Calvin, *Institutes* 3.2.2–6.

37 2 Timothy 4:13.

38 On the importance of the Greek word *plērophoria* see *SPT* 30.38, note 20.

peccatorum, quia credunt. Nec verum est quod Pontificii oggerunt, assumptionem illam in fidelibus, *Ego credo*, non esse verbum* aut testimonium* Dei, cum eorum quisque habeat *Spiritum Sanctum, qui testimonium* reddit spiritui ipsorum quod sint filii Dei*, Rom. 8, 16. *qui est pignus in cordibus eorum*, 2 Cor 1, 22. et *arrha haereditatis nostrae*, Eph. 1, 14. Nam electi certo possunt* cognoscere se esse in fide, *Vosmetipsos probate, num sitis in fide, ipsi vos probate, an non cognoscitis vosmetipsos, quia Christus Jesus in vobis est? nisi forte reprobi estis*, 2 Cor. 13, 5. Quibus succinit August. Lib. 13. *De Trinit.* cap. 1.[a] scribens, *quemque credentium in corde suo videre fidem, eamque tenere certissima scientia, et clamare conscientia*. Ideo fideles indubii profitentur, *Nos credidimus et cognovimus*, Joh. 6, 69. *Credo Domine*, Marc. 9, 24. *Scio cui credidi*, 2 Tim. 1, 12.

XXII Huc facit, quod Christus quotiescumque legitur peccata remisisse, toties dixisse perhibetur, *Confide, remissa sunt tibi peccata*, qui certe temeritatis et superbiae occasionem ministrare noluit. Quod etiam Scriptura nos obligat ad gratias Deo agendas de justificatione nostra, quam nisi nos fide accepisse certi simus, fieri non potest* ut acceptam agnoscamus, cum ineptum sit beneficium agnoscere, quod datum sit necne, nescias. Impudentiae praeterea immanis est, eos arcessere temeritatis, qui Spiritui Sancto credunt eos compellanti. Denique, quomodo potest gratia voluntarie accipi, quod adversarii contendunt, non tamen sciri ab eo qui eam accipit, num eam habeat? Nam ad rem* motu animi voluntario accipiendam, necessarium est, ut qui eam sponte accipit, sciat et rem* sibi datam, et se vere eam accipere, et acceptam possidere.

[a] Augustine, *De trinitate* 13.1.3 (CCSL 50A:383).

believe, they have received forgiveness of sins.[39] Nor is it true what the papal teachers put forward, namely that when the believers affirm "I believe," it is not the Word* or testimony* of God, since all believers possess the Holy Spirit, "who bears witness* to their spirit that they are children of God" (Romans 8:16);[40] "he is the pledge placed within their hearts" (2 Corinthians 1:22) and "the deposit of our inheritance" (Ephesians 1:14). For those who have been chosen are able* to know with certainty that they are of the faith: "Examine yourselves to see whether you are in the faith; examine yourselves to see whether or not you know that Christ Jesus is in you—unless, of course, you are reprobates" (2 Corinthians 13:5). Augustine chimes in with these texts when he writes "that every believer sees faith in his own heart, and holds on to it with the surest knowledge and declares it in his conscience" (*On the Trinity*, book 13, chapter 1). For this reason believers profess without any doubt: "We believe and know" (John 6:69), "I believe, Lord" (Mark 9:24), and "I know in whom I have believed" (2 Timothy 1:12).

Of relevance here is the fact that whenever one reads that Christ has forgiven 22
sins it is also reported that he said: "Have confidence, your sins are forgiven;" clearly, he does not want to provide an opportunity for arrogant pride. There is also the fact that we are obliged by Scripture to render thanks to God for our justification, for unless we are sure that we have received [justification] in faith, it would not be possible* for us to acknowledge that it was received, since it would be absurd to acknowledge a benefit if one doesn't know for sure whether or not he has received it. Moreover, it would be an enormously shameful thing to charge those people with arrogance who believe that it was the Holy Spirit who summoned them. And finally how can grace possibly be received willingly (as our opponents claim) by someone if the one who has received it does not really know whether or not he has it? For it must be the case that for something* to be received by a willful movement of the mind that the one who receives it of his own accord not only knows that the thing* has been given to him, but also that he really does receive it and that he is taking possession of what he has received.

---

39 This is the basic form of the so-called practical syllogism. The major is the promise of the Gospel, the minor is the self-consciousness of the believer ("I believe"), and the conclusion is that the promise is true in his particular case. See further Richard A. Muller, *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition: On the Work of Christ and the Order of Salvation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 268–269.

40 Cf. Bellarmine, *De Justificatione* 1.10 (*Opera* 6:165b–166a). Bellarmine argues that also a heretic is convinced that he believes, but it is only his deceptive opinion, not the word of God.

XXIII Ad hoc autem non sufficit simplex, ut loquuntur *probabilitas*, neque humana tantum et *experimentalis* certitudo, ut nonnullis placuit; qualis est ejus qui cum calorem habet, certus est se habere quod sensu percipit. Alius enim est animae sensus quam corporis, nec debet sensus ille internus a Divina revelatione sejungi; et cum fides ea testimonio* Spiritus Sancti exhibeatur, et quisque teneatur credere revelationibus divinis, fidem illam non aliter quam divinam nuncupandam censemus; et licet pro objecto directe non habeat dogmata communia, quae quidem supponit, sed singularem persuasionem de propria gratia, non minus tamen omnem dubitationem excludere debet; quam cum amplectitur fidei articulos, qui etsi universalitate excedant speciale illud fidei objectum, illis tamen certitudine et dubitationis exclusione non cedit.

XXIV *Formale* fidei *objectum*, id est, illud in quo ultimo fides resolvitur, est prima veritas revelata, quatenus consideratur, ut immediate* movens, adeoque inducens ut credatur objectum illud quod materiale diximus. Nam ut ei qui credit alicui homini non propter auctoritatem vel rationes,* sed quia ille hoc dicit, ejus veracitas est loco rationis* formalis sub qua dictis ejus assentitur: sic in rebus* fidei credimus verbo* Dei nobis aliquid revelanti, non propter alterius auctoritatem, aut propter argumenta, aut ejus rei quae revelatur, apparentiam, sed quia Deus hoc dicit. Ac proinde ejus, in dictis suis omnibus, veracitas et infallibilis auctoritas ratio est formalis fidei nostrae. Sic Paulus 1. ad Thess. 2, 13. *Accepistis verbum auditus, non ut verbum hominum, sed ut vere est verbum Dei.* 1Joh. 5, 10. *Qui credit in Filium, habet testimonium* Dei in se*. Matt. 16, 17. *Caro*

For this conviction it is not simply enough, however, for there to be—as 23
they say—a 'likelihood' or a merely human and experiential assurance, as some would like to have it.[41] For that would be like someone who is convinced that he is warm simply because he feels with his senses that he is warm. But the sense of one's soul is different from physical sense, and we should not break the link between that internal sense and God's revelation. And while it is the testimony* of the Holy Spirit which furnishes that faith, and while everyone is bound to believe the divine revelations, we hold the view that that faith should not be given any other name than divine faith.[42] And even though that faith does not have the general doctrines directly as its object (although it surely does suppose them) but a personal conviction of one's own grace, it should nonetheless be free of all doubt; and while it does include in its scope the articles of the faith (which do exceed that special object of the faith by their generality), it still is not inferior to them in certainty and lack of doubt.

The formal object of faith, i.e., the thing into which faith ultimately resolves 24
itself, is the revealed first truth, insofar as one considers it as immediately* moving to and even leading to believe that object which we called the 'material' object. For when someone believes someone else not on account of an authority or reasoned arguments* but simply because he is the one who says so, his veracity takes the place of the formal reason* for which one agrees with his statements. So too in matters* of the faith we believe God's Word* as it reveals something to us not because of someone else's authority, arguments, or the evident proof of the thing revealed, but because it is God who says it. And so it is his veracity and infallible authority in all that he says that is the formal reason for our faith. Thus Paul says in 1 Thessalonians 2:13: "You have received the word that was heard, not as the word of men, but as it really is, the word of God." 1 John 5:10: "Anyone who believes in the Son, has the testimony* of God in his heart."

---

41 The common view of the medieval Scholastics was that one could not know with absolute certainty to be in the state of grace, except in the rare case of a special private revelation. One can have conjectural knowledge through certain signs, in particular through experiencing inner dispositions like rejoicing in God, despising worldly things and not being aware of any mortal sin. See, for example, Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 1/2.112.5. The Council of Trent stated that a person could not know "without any doubt" to be justified (DH 1534) or say "with absolute and infallible certitude" that he would persevere till the end "without special revelation" (DH 1566). Cf. also Domingo de Soto, *De natura et gratia* (Paris: Foucher, 1549), 253–255. De Soto uses the terms 'likelihood' and 'experimental knowledge.'

42 'Divine faith' is worked by God while 'human faith' is produced by evidence, still the personal faith in the forgiveness of sins is divine faith, because the witness of the Spirit is a divine revelation.

et sanguis non revelavit tibi, sed Pater meus qui in coelis est. Principium* ergo in quod resolvitur vera fides, hoc est, *Prima veritas falli non potest*.

XXV Gravissime ergo falluntur, et Ecclesiam in Dei locum substituunt, qui in autoritatem Ecclesiae fidem nostram resolvi debere contendunt. Nam aut Ecclesiae primam veritatem tribuunt. et sic eam Deum faciunt; aut loco verae fidei humanam tantum credulitatem inducunt. Nos vero, etsi Ecclesiae testimonium* inter extrinseca *motiva*, quae hominem quodammodo ad credendum disponunt, ex praecipuis esse concedamus: nunquam tamen adducemur, ut credamus eam esse infallibilis in proponendo et judicando auctoritatis. Sed quia quaeri potest, quomodo constet nobis de primae veritatis sententia ut in eam resolvatur fides, respondemus, auctoritatem illam Dei loquentis duplici modo* nobis innotescere, externo et interno, sine quo externus non sufficeret. Loquitur nobis Deus in verbo* suo scripto, et praedicato per Ecclesiae ministerium, secundum quod scriptum est; sed praeter propositionem illam externam, lumen supernaturale* suppeditat, dum immediate* cuique fidelium interius loquitur, cum autem in corde penetrat interior ista ejus locutio, vera fides ingeneratur, quae sine supernaturali illo lumine, fidei et credulitatis humanae tantum rationem haberet.

XXVI Ex his quae dicta sunt, de forma fidei, praesertim verae et justificantis, non est difficile judicium. Spectatur enim et consistit in ea relatione* et convenientia, qua unusquisque credens, non solum generale illud veritatis revelatae verbum,* sed in eo, ac praesertim in verbo Evangelii, gratiae* Dei singulares promissiones sibi applicat, sua in hypothesi firma persuasione appropriando,[a]

[a] faciendo: 1642.

Matthew 16:17: "Flesh and blood did not reveal this to you, but my Father who is in heaven." Thus the principle* wherein true faith is resolved is: 'the first truth cannot fail.'[43]

And so those people make a very serious mistake when they contend that 25
our faith should be resolved into the authority of the Church, and they put the Church in the place of God.[44] For they either ascribe the first truth to the Church and so turn it into God, or they replace true faith with merely human credulity. As for us, though we do concede that the Church's testimony* is one of the foremost extrinsic motives that cause people to be disposed to believe, we can never be led to believe that it has infallible authority in putting forward propositions and passing judgment on them. But as to the possible question, how for us the assertion is certain that faith is resolved into the first truth, we reply that the authority of God as he speaks is made known to us in two ways,* an external and an internal one (without which the external one would not suffice). God speaks to us in his written Word,* and also as it is proclaimed through the Church's ministry according to what is written. Besides that external presentation it is God who supplies the supernatural* light when He speaks internally directly* to the heart of each and every believer, and as his speech is piercing the heart deeply within, true faith is ingenerated, which would have the character only of human credulity and gullibility were it not enlightened by that supernatural light.

From what we've said it isn't difficult to determine the form of faith (espe- 26
cially of true, justifying faith). For it exists and is situated in that relationship* and correspondence whereby each and every believer not only believes that general word* of the revealed truth, but applies to himself especially the special promises of God's grace* that are in it, particularly in the word of the Gospel; and with solid conviction he makes his own in *hypothesis* those promises that are promised generally in *thesis*, so that he possesses undoubted assurance

43 God who reveals is the first truth; see thesis 2, note 3 above.

44 It is not quite clear whom Rivetus has in mind here. The question was discussed by Roman Catholic theologians, but as Suárez testifies, most of them rejected this position, which was traced back to Durandus of St. Pourçain: see Francisco Suárez, *Opus de triplici virtute theologica*, disp. 3, sectio 10 (Paris: Edmundus Martin, 1621), 119–120; cf. Francisco Suárez, *Opera omnia* (Paris: Vives, 1856–1887), 12:94. Suárez refers to the Franciscan theologian Miguel de Medina (1489–1578) as the most important representative of this thesis. See Miguel de Medina, *Christianae paraenesis siue De recta in Deum fide libri septem*, book 5, chapter 11 (Venice: Iordani Zileti, 1564), 163–170. Suárez also mentions Martin Pérez de Ayala, Gabriel Biel, and Jacques Almain.

quae in thesi et generaliter promittuntur, ut sit ἀδιάκριτος πληροφορία de reconciliatione nostri per Christum, Joh. 17, 15. Matt. 9, 2. Gal. 2, 20. Joh. 1, 12.

XXVII Errant ergo qui *Caritatem* formam esse fidei asserunt, non quidem, ut ipsi fatentur, intrinsecam, sed extrinsecam; quippe quae det illi non ut sit, *sed ut moveatur, quomodo a Spiritu movetur et agitur corpus*. Quae Bellarmini[a] verba, si de spiritu hominis accipiantur, continent contradictionem in adjecto, quia spiritus est intrinseca corporis forma. Si vero de respiratione intelligantur, tum caritas esset effectus fidei quod nos volumus. Deinde in eo absurdus est, quod cum agnoscat fidem habere suam intrinsecam formam quae non sit caritas, eandem informem esse velit caritate destitutam. cum a forma intrinseca, non ab extrinseca, secundum illum, denominatio rei* sumi debeat. Si vero omnium virtutum ut volunt, caritas sit forma effective, quatenus eas movet ad actiones suas; certe fides erit potius caritatis et omnium aliarum virtutum forma, quia *quidquid non fit ex fide, peccatum est*, Rom. 14, 23. Denique fides caritatem praecedit natura,* et ex ea caritas procedit. *Finis mandati est caritas, ex mundo corde, conscientia bona et fide non ficta*, 1 Tim. 1, 5. Sufficit igitur ut caritatem fidei justificantis ἐνέργειαν atque effectum esse dicamus, perpetuo et indissolubili foedere cum ea conjunctum, non autem ejusdem formam sive intrinsecam sive extrinsecam.

XXVIII Finis* fidei salvificae duplex est. 1. est ἀρχιτεκτονικός, gloria gratiae Dei Servatoris nostri in Filio dilecto, Rom. 4, 20. Rom. 11, 36. 1 Thess. 1, 10. et 12. Proximus* vero et subordinatus, salus animarum nostrarum, quam Petrus *mercedem fidei* appellat, 1 Pet. 1, 9. Est autem haec fides una specie* et objecto in omnibus, etsi numero et gradu in suis subjectis* varietur.

XXIX Effecta fidei pene sunt innumera, sive interna in nobis, sive extra nos. Praecipua sunt, *Justificatio*, quae quidem fidei effectum est, non ut illa est habitus* vel actus* aut opus aliquod, sed ratione objecti, id est, Christi per eam apprehensi,

[a] Bellarmine, *De iustificatione* 2.4 (*Opera* 6:219a).

about our reconciliation through Christ (John 17:15; Matthew 9:2; Galatians 2:20; John 1:12).[45]

And so they err who claim that the form of faith is love, although (as they themselves admit) it is an external and not internal form, and although love causes faith not so much to come into existence "as to be moved, like a body that is moved and driven by a spirit."[46] If these words of Bellarmine are taken as concerning the spirit of a human being, then they contain a contradiction in terms because the [human] spirit is the internal form of the body. But if the words about the spirit are taken to be about breathing [something] out, then love would be an effect or outcome of faith, as we would have it. He is also wrong in that while he admits that faith has its own internal form that is not love, he wants faith to be 'unformed' when it is deprived of love, since in his view the matter* should take its name from the internal and not the external form. But if, as they would have it, love is the form of all virtues by its effectiveness insofar as it moves them to perform their actions, then surely it is faith, rather, that would be the form of all the other virtues, because "whatever is not from faith is sin" (Romans 14:23).[47] And lastly, by nature* faith comes before love, and love proceeds from it. And "the purpose of the commandment is love from a pure heart, a good conscience, and a sincere faith" (1 Timothy 1:5). Therefore it is sufficient for us to say that love is the actuality or outcome of justifying faith and it is joined by a permanent perpetual and unbreakable pact with it, though we do not say that it is its form, whether internal or external. 27

Saving faith has two goals.* In an architectonic sense, it is the glory of the grace of God our Savior in his beloved Son (Romans 4:20; Romans 11:36; 1 Thessalonians 1:10 and 12).[48] The proximate* and subordinate goal is the salvation of our souls which Peter calls the "the reward of faith" (1 Peter 1:9). This faith, however, is one in sort* and object in everyone, although it varies in its subjects* in number and degree. 28

The effects of faith are almost numberless, both inwardly in us and outwardly outside of us. The primary effects are: 1) justification, which certainly is an effect of faith, not insofar as [faith] is a disposition* or act* or some deed, but because 29

45 For the distinction between "in hypothesis" and "in thesis" see thesis 14, note 21 above.

46 Bellarmine, *De Justificatione* 2.4 (*Opera* 6:219a). In medieval scholastic theology, the distinction between 'formed faith' (*fides formata*) and 'unformed faith' (*fides informis*) is common. The latter lacks the theological virtue of charity or love of God. It is 'dead' and does not save. It resembles what Rivetus called 'historical' or 'dogmatic' faith in thesis 7.

47 Rivetus seems to refer (indirectly) to Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 2/2.23.8.1.

48 The phrase "in an architectonic sense" alludes to Aristotle's favorite example of final causality: the plan of a house in the mind of an architect.

qua ratione causae* instrumentali metonymice tribuuntur, quae per illam princeps causa* efficit; quo sensu etiam fidei tribuitur. 2. *Sanctificatio*, et cordium purificatio, et in summa omnia bona quibus a Deo afficimur. Quod in justificationis negotio diligenter animadvertendum est adversus eos, qui Socinum secuti, volunt fidem esse formam justificationis nobis inhaerentem, et nostram coram Deo justitiam, quae gratiosa quidem aestimatione, etiamsi rigore juris non sit perfecta loco illius ac vice acceptetur, quomodo *imputationis* vocem* detorquent.

DE PERSEVERANTIA SANCTORUM.

XXX Salvificae fidei de qua hactenus dictum est, necessarium adjunctum est *perseverantia* ad finem usque, cujus etiam certitudo in verae fidei objecto continetur, et in subjecto* inesse debet vera fide praedito; alioqui non esset fides salvifica, aut justificans, nec enim alius nisi *qui crediderit*, Marc. 16, 16. nec alius nisi *qui perseveraverit usque in finem*, Matt. 24, 4. *salvus erit*.

XXXI Perseverantiam in hac quaestione Ethice non accipimus pro illa fortitudinis parte, ut est quaedam virtus animum perficiens, ut non obstante molestia quam afferre solet ipsa diuturnitas temporis necessarii in perficiendo aliquo opere bono, persistat in officio usque ad operis consummationem; quam post Ciceronem August. lib. 83. *Quaest.* 31.[a] definit in *ratione bene constituta stabilem et perpetuam mansionem*. Sed ut est continuatio et conservatio fidei, spei et caritatis, quarum actus* per totam vitam debent durare, et ideo non requiritur in iis perseverantia usque ad finem alicujus operis tantum, sed usque ad finem vitae.

XXXII Dicitur autem, 1. de actu* nunquam prorsus interrupto, sed continuato, et eundem semper tenorem habente; 2. de actu quidem secundum quid interrupto, ad finem tamen aliquando perducto, qui certe modi* locum habent in

[a] Augustine, *De diversis quaestionibus octoginta tribus* 31.1 (CCSL 44A:43). Cf. Cicero *De inventione* 2.54.164 and *Philippicae* 7.5.14. Cicero has 'permansio' instead of 'mansio'.

of the object that it has, that is, because of Christ, who is appropriated through it. Because whatever the primary cause* produces is attributed by metonymy to the instrumental cause,* in this sense justification is also attributed to faith. 2), Sanctification and the cleansing of our hearts, briefly, everything good whereby God affects us. And in the matter of justification we should be particularly watchful of the followers of Socinus, who would want the form of justification to be something that is inherent within us, our righteousness before God. And by a generous interpretation of 'our righteousness' (for in the strict legal sense our righteousness is not perfect) they take this instead of justification, and thereby twist the meaning of the word* 'imputation.'[49]

On the Perseverance of the Saints

Saving faith, about which we have spoken thus far, must be accompanied 30
by perseverance to the very end. Now the object of true faith contains also the certainty of this perseverance, and so it must be present in the subject* who has been endowed with true faith. If not, faith would not be saving faith or justifying faith, for no-one except "he who believes" (Mark 16:16) and no-one except "he who endures to the end will be saved" (Matthew 24:13).

In dealing with the question of perseverance, we take the word not in the 31
moral sense for a part of human fortitude, that is, as a virtue which perfects the mind, in that, notwithstanding the hardship that comes with the long length of time that is required to finish some good work, the mind keeps doing what it has to do right until the final completion of the work.[50] Augustine, following Cicero (*Book of 83 Questions*, question 31), defines it as 'steady, ongoing continuation in a matter that is well-planned.' But we take the word to mean the continuous safe-keeping of faith, hope, and love, the deeds* of which ought to last throughout one's entire life. Thus it is not necessary to persevere in them only until the end of some work or other, but all the way to the end of one's lifetime.

And the word [perseverance] is used also for an act* that is not ever inter- 32
rupted at all but carries on, maintaining the same course. The word is used also for an act that in some respect was interrupted, but eventually was carried

49 The *Racovian Catechism* reverses the concept of God imputing to believers Christ's righteousness for faith by stating that God both 'requires' and is 'satisfied with' the obedience of those "whom he justifies by his grace, and to whom he imputes faith for righteousness," in *RC*, 322, 324.

50 In the classical theory of virtues, there are four 'cardinal' (i.e. 'pivotal') virtues: justice, prudence, temperance, and fortitude, each of which is subdivided in a number of other virtues. Moral perseverance is considered part of fortitude.

Sanctorum perseverantia; sed ratione* diversa. Quia ad primum modum referuntur habitus* fidei, spei et caritatis semel donati, quia perpetuo manent sine *intercisione*, nunquam enim auferuntur. Ad secundum vero actiones, professio, et sensus earundem; in quibus aliquam interruptionem cadere fatemur, quae tamen non impedit quominus perseverantia sit et dicatur, qui enim interdum cadit, ad finem usque perseverare dicitur, manente semper habitu, et saepe actu quodam secundo, etsi languido, quibus tamquam vinculis cum Deo semper conjunctus est, dum perseverantia quantitatis et graduum utcunque intercisa, habitus et qualitatis* perseverantia non cessat.

XXXIII Definimus ergo perseverantiam, continuum et perpetuum progressum et perdurationem vere fidelium, in accepta semel gratia* et fide justificante usque ad vitae finem, gratuito Dei beneficio secundum aeternum propositum electionis, communicatum sine ullo fidelium merito, per efficaciam et virtutem Spiritus Sancti per Evangelii ministerium operantis, et obsignantis promissiones gratiae, ut in iis finaliter maneant, et ab iis nunquam penitus excidant, ad gloriam Dei donantis, et fidelium perseverantium salutem, Rom. 11, 29. Matt. 24, 24. 2 Cor. 1, 8. Phil. 1, 6. et 2, 13. 1 Pet. 5, 10. 1 Joh. 3, 9.

XXXIV Causa* efficiens primaria et secundaria eadem est quae fidei, quam qui semel dedit, semper conservat, et iisdem utitur ordinariis mediis, et instrumentalibus causis,* hoc est, verbi divini praedicatione et Sacramentorum* administratione. Cumque sit donum mere gratuitum, extra Deum et Christum, nulla quaerenda est causa seu προηγουμένη, intus movens, seu προκαταρκτικὴ, extra provocans. Nam id Deus largitur ex mera gratia et amore erga eos quos fide ab aeterno donare decrevit, ad id etiam ordinato Christi merito, quo nobis hanc in fide perseverantiam acquisivit. Hinc est quod Paulus Rom. 5, 9. et 10. ex justificatione et reconciliatione nostra per Christi mortem acquisita, salutis nostrae futurum complementum, quod[a] sine perseverantia esse non potest, colligit. Et Christus ipse Joh. 10, 15. postquam dixit *se animam suam posuisse pro ovibus suis*, addidit v. 28. *non perituras eas in aeternum, nec aliquem posse eas rapere de manu sua.*

[a] qui: original disputation.

through to the end. These kinds* of act do have their place in the perseverance of the saints, but for a different reason,* because the dispositions* of faith, hope, and love that were once bestowed belong to the first kind of act, since they remain permanently without interruption and they are never removed. But the individual actions, profession, and sense of them belong to the second mode; we would allow some interruption to befall these actions, although such interruption in no way prevents the existence and identification of perseverance, for we still say that someone who on occasion falls still perseveres until the end, because the disposition always remained and often also the second act in some way, though it is weak. And by these, the person always remains tied to God, as if by a chain, while the perseverance, though interrupted in amount or degree, does not cease to be perseverance in its disposition or quality.*

33 Therefore we define perseverance as the continuous, perpetual progress and successful endurance of true believers, through the grace* and justifying faith once received, right unto the end of life, thanks to the gracious will according to God's eternal plan of election, bestowed without any merit of the believers, by the efficacious power of the Holy Spirit who works through the administration of the Gospel and who signs and seals the promises of grace, so that believers may abide in them forever and never entirely fall away from them, for the glory of God who bestows it, and for the salvation of the persevering believers (Romans 11:29; Matthew 24:24; 2 Corinthians 1:8; Philippians 1:6 and 2:13; 1 Peter 5:10; 1 John 3:9).

34 The primary and secondary efficient causes* are the same as the ones for faith, which He who at one time gave it also preserves forever. For this He employs also the same ordinary means and instrumental causes,* that is, the preaching of the Word of God and the administration of the sacraments.* And since this gift is entirely unmerited, we should not look for a cause for it beyond God and Christ, whether that be an impelling cause (one that moves within), or an external initiating cause (one that stimulates from without). For God bestows it out of mere grace and love towards those whom He has decreed from eternity to endow with faith; and it was for this that Christ's merit was ordained, and by it he has obtained for us this perseverance in the faith. Hence it is that from our justification and reconciliation obtained by Christ's death Paul gathers the future fulfillment of our salvation, which cannot happen without perseverance (Romans 5:9 and 10). And Christ himself, after he said that he "laid down his life for his sheep" (John 10:15), added "and they shall never perish, nor shall anyone be able to snatch them from my hand" (John 10:28).

xxxv Excluditur ergo a perseverantia Sanctorum, meritum omne condigni; quod etiam aliquatenus Pontificii fatentur, etsi quod una manu dant, altera auferant, dum asserunt, *auxilia sufficientia actualia, quae necessaria esse justo affirmant, ut superatis tentationibus gravioribus in vita occurrentibus perseverare usque in finem possit, cadere sub tale meritum*, exclusa tantum a merito prima gratia. De merito *congrui*, quod vocant, haesitanter affirmant, *probabile esse, mereri justum suis orationibus et pietatis studiis finalem perseverantiam, licet non semper consequatur ejusmodi praemium, cum certa promissione et lege non nitatur*, Greg. de Valent. Tom. 2. in Thom. disp. 8. q. 6. §. 4.[a] *non intelligentes neque quae loquuntur, neque de quibus affirmant*, 1 Tim. 1, 7. Sed errorem errant

[a] Gregory of Valencia, *Commentarii theologici*, 4 vols. (Ingolstadt: Sartorius, 1591–1597) 2:1394.

For this reason any notion of fully merited reward[51] is excluded from the 35
preservation of the saints; the papal teachers also admit this to some extent, although what they grant with the one hand they take away with the other when they make the claim that "the sufficient, actual means of assistance, which they state the just man must have so that, when the more serious temptations that one meets in life are overcome, he may be able to persevere until the end. These means fall in this [category] of merit" with only the first grace being excluded from merit. Concerning the merit of congruity, as they call it, they make the hesitant claim that "it is probable that the just man earns final preservation by his prayers and other pursuits of piety;" but this kind of reward is not always obtained "since it does not rely on a definite promise or rule" (Gregory of Valencia, [*Theological commentary on*] *Thomas Aquinas's* [Summa theologiae], volume 2, disputation 8, question 6, paragraph 4).[52] "They do not understand what they are speaking about, nor what they are affirming" (1Timothy 1:7). But people make a ruinous mistake when they put forward the

51 *Meritum condigni* (or *ex* or *de condigno*): merit of condignity or "condign merit; also called full merit as opposed to a half-merit or *meritum de congruo*" (*DLGTT* s.v. "meritum de condigni"). According to Thomas Aquinas a *meritum de condigno* is fully deserving of its reward, and that only applies insofar as it is an absolutely good work of the Holy Spirit; but insofar as the deed issues from the human will, there can only be a *meritum de congruo*, which is not truly deserving, yet it receives its fitting, proportionate reward on the basis of divine generosity. Aquinas denies that one can merit in either sense the first, justifying grace or perseverance, but acknowledges that one who has been justified by grace, can merit eternal life and can merit growth in grace, though only *de congruo* and not *de condigno* (Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 1/2.114). When someone does what he can (*facere quod in se est*) he is therefore accepted by God as satisfying the requirement for the infusion of divine grace. The merit of congruity has no other grounds on which reward is based than the mere generosity of God. See Heiko A. Oberman, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology: Gabriel Biel and Late Medieval Nominalism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963), 172–184. See also *SPT* 32.6, 33 antithesis 3, and 34.38.

52 Gregory of Valencia (1549–1603), Jesuit theologian, studied in Salamanca and taught dogmatic and 'controversial theology' in Ingolstadt, Germany and in Rome. He supported his fellow Jesuit Molina against the Dominican Bañez in the so-called *De Auxiliis* controversy. The Jesuits tried to offer an interpretation of Aquinas that would allow for a decisive role of human free will in grace, contrary to the Bañezian reading of Aquinas. They distinguished God's special gift of justifying 'efficient grace'—which is given only to the elect, includes man's consent, and results in 'habitual grace' as a kind of inherent disposition or quality in the person—from God's general gift of 'sufficient' grace or means of assistance (*auxilia*), offered to all, which do not include man's free consent and do not result in habitual grace, but remain merely 'actual.' Gregory wrote a dogmatic handbook based on the *Summa theologiae* of Aquinas in four volumes, the *Commentarii theologici*, first published in Ingolstadt.

perniciosissimum qui asserere non verentur, perseverantiam vere fidelium non esse electionis effectum, sed potius ex perseverantiae praevisione factam esse electionem, et nihil Deum in fideli operari, ut perseveret ad finem usque, censent, cujus efficax usus, perinde ut abusus aut neglectus, non pendeat a libero hominis arbitrio,* Qua sententia Pelagianismum renovant, et homini gloriandi materiam subministrant, orationis etiam pro dono perseverantiae necessitatem elevant; cum, secundum eos, sit donum generale omnibus paratum, sed sub conditione quae non a Deo, sed ab arbitrio nostro pendet.

XXXVI Materiam *in qua*, sive subjectum* adaequatum perseverantiae solos et omnes regenitos esse, in definitione supposuimus, et fide justificante donatos. Quisquis enim electus est, fide donatur suo tempore, et quisquis vere credit, perseverat ad finem usque. Alioqui fides quae non perseverat, non est vera justificans fides. Nam etsi quicquid est verum *secundum essentiam*,* non semper sit verum *secundum perseverantiam* et firmitatem, neque veri natura* a permanentia et firmitate pendeat: id tamen certum est, nonnulla esse, a quorum naturae et essentiae veritate, ratio firmitatis et permanentiae petenda est. Quo in genere, ex Scripturis, fidem justificantem esse supra probavimus;* cujus veritatis perseverantia est effectus necessarius, ex quo de veritate fidei a posteriori fit judicium. Falluntur ergo et fallunt, qui vere justificatorum duas constituunt species,* alteram electorum perseverantium, alteram non electorum, qui etsi aliquando vera fide donati et justificati, sine poenitentia tandem in apostasia moriantur; qui etiam inter electos ita distinguunt, ut velint in eorum plerisque fidem ad tempus plane *intercidere*, eosque prorsus ad tempus *gratia excidere*, quamvis postea poenitentia salutari oblata, eandem proprio arbitrio* acceptent. At electi sunt velut *arbores quarum folia non decidunt, et fructum ferunt in*

claim that perseverance of the true believers is not an effect of the election, but instead that election was produced from [God's] foresight of perseverance. And they are of the opinion that the effective use (in the same manner as the abuse or neglect) of everything God has worked in the believer to cause him to persevere until the end depends on man's free choice.* With this notion they renew Pelagianism and supply material for praising man, and they remove the need to even pray for the gift of perseverance. For, according to them, it is a universal gift prepared for everyone, with a condition that does not depend on God but on our choice.[53]

The material in which [perseverance occurs], or its fitting subject,* are all 36
those people—and only those people—who have been regenerated and who have been endowed with justifying faith; this was our assumption when we provided the definition [of perseverance]. For everyone who has been elected is in due time endowed with faith, and whoever truly believes perseveres until the end. Otherwise, faith that does not persevere is not true, justifying faith. Admittedly, whatever is true as far as its essence* is concerned is not always true as far as its durability or strength is concerned; and the nature* of what is true does not depend on its durability and strength.[54] Yet it is certain that there are some things that possess durability and permanence by virtue of their true nature and essence. We have shown* earlier from Scripture that justifying faith is of this sort; the perseverance of its truth is a necessary effect on the basis of which we can afterwards judge about the truth of the faith. Therefore they are led astray and they lead others astray who posit that there are two species* of truly justified people: the one, of the elect who do persevere, and the other, of those who are not elect, who although they were granted true faith at some point in time and were justified, still die in apostasy without repenting. And they even make a distinction between the elect so that they would have it that in many of the elect faith is for a time lost altogether, and that they completely fall from grace, although later, when they are offered repentance that leads to salvation, they accept it of their own choosing.*[55] But [we say] the elect are like "trees whose leaves do not fall, and they bear fruit in season" and so always

53 Perhaps Rivetus is referring to Arminius who in his *Apology against Thirty-One Defamatory Articles* wrote that no believer will decline from the faith unless by willingly yielding and neglecting to work out his salvation in a conscientious manner (*Works* 2:726).

54 E.g. a person may be truly wise at a certain time and later become foolish. But, Rivetus argues, this does not go for true faith, which must endure till the end.

55 It is not exactly clear to whom Rivetus is referring here, but in general the Remonstrants and the Roman Catholics accepted that the elect could lose faith and grace for some time, though they would repent and regain faith before dying.

tempore, ergo semper vitali succo praediti, Ps. 1, 3. Qui *cadentes non dejiciuntur, sed manu Dei sustentantur*, Ps. 37, 24. Sunt ut *mons qui non dimovetur, sed in seculum permanet*, Ps. 125, 1. Cum quibus Dei Spiritus in aeternum manet, Joh. 14, 17. 1 Joh. 2, 27. Videantur praeterea hi loci, Matt. 7, 24. et 25. Matt. 24, 24. Eph. 1, 13. et 14. et 4, 30. etc.

XXXVII Reprobos vero nunquam justificari, satis ex eo patet, quod Paulus Rom. 8, 30. asserit, Deum *glorificasse quos justificavit*, non glorificasse autem reprobos: si quis vult ut probemus,* ei potius elleboro quam argumentis est opus. Quamvis autem sint inter eos qui modo quodam Christi esse dicuntur, per fidei confessionem, per Sacramentorum* communionem, et communem Ecclesiae nuncupationem et societatem, revera tamen in Christo non fuerunt; intra limitem fidei esse videbantur, sed *in specie* credebant, *sola Christi confessione inhaerentes, non caritatis vimine se colligantes*, Cyril. *In Joh.* lib. 10, c. 24.[a] Qui[b] ita credunt, *ut diligant magis hominum gloriam, quam gloriam Dei*, Joh. 12, 43. vere non credunt.[c] *Quomodo enim possunt credere, qui gloriam a se invicem accipiunt, et gloriam quae a solo Deo est, non quaerunt?* Joh. 5, 44. Si qui igitur tales, qui vocationis[d] externae praerogativa, non electionis beneficio, *regni Filii* aliquando esse videbantur, a vero deflectunt, et ad vomitum suum redeunt, non inde potest inferri *Sanctorum Apostasia*, nisi Sancti sint illi, *qui viam Cain ingressi sunt, et deceptione mercedis qua deceptus est Balaam, effusi sunt*, Jud. vers. 11. qualis est impurus ille, qui primus plusquam profanam phrasim, Ecclesiae obtrudere frustra conatus est.

XXXVIII Neque tamen, quod nobis per calumniam affingitur, negamus, Sanctos aliquando labi posse,* et labi reipsa per carnis imbecillitatem, in peccata non tantum levia, sed etiam gravissima; vel eos absoluta* quadam impossibilitate impediri, quo minus fidem amittere possint, affirmamus; sed tantum limitata,

---

[a] The reference is possibly to Cyril's exposition of John 15:2 (MPG 74:348). The same Latin translation can be found also in Jodocus Coccius, *Thesaurus catholicus* (Cologne: Arnold Quentel, 1599–1601), 2:231. [b] Tales: 1642. [c] ideo vere non credunt: 1642. [d] Si quidam igitur qui vocationis: 1642.

possess the sap of life (Psalm 1:3). And "when they fall they do not lose hope, but they are upheld by God's hand" (Psalm 37:24). They are like "a mountain that is not moved, but that abides forever" (Psalm 125:1). God's Spirit stays with them forever (John 14:17; 1John 2:27). See, furthermore, these places: Matthew 7:24–25; Matthew 24:24; Ephesians 1:13 and 14, and 4:30, etc.

37 It is clear enough from what Paul states in Romans 8:30 that reprobates are never justified; God "has glorified those whom He has justified," but He has not glorified the reprobates. If someone wishes us to prove* it, he is more in need of hellebore than arguments![56] And although there are some among the reprobates who are reported somehow to belong to Christ because they confessed their faith, shared in the sacraments,* and used the name of the Church and associated with it—they were not, in actual fact, in Christ. They appeared to be within the boundaries of faith, but they were believers in appearance only, "adhering only to professing Christ, but not binding themselves with cords of love" (Cyril,[57] *On John*, book 10, chapter 24). They are the sort who believe "so that they cherish the glory of men more than the glory of God" (John 12:43) and so they are not truly believing. "For how are they able to believe who receive glory from one another and do not seek the glory that comes from God alone?" (John 5:44). If there are some, then, who by the privilege of an external calling but not the gift of election seem to belong to the "kingdom of the Son" for some time, who turn aside from the truth and return to their own vomit, that is not a reason to bring forward [the argument of] "the apostasy of the saints"—unless they are the saints "who have gone the way of Cain, and have rushed for profit into Balaam's error" (Jude 11). How filthy is he who was the first to try in vain to foist this rather profane expression on the Church.[58]

38 However, though we are accused of it, we do not deny the fact that saints are able* to fall from time to time, and through the weakness of their flesh they can fall seriously into trivial and even very grievous sins.[59] Or, we state positively that in an absolute* sense it is impossible for saints to lose their faith; but it is possible in a limited way, only as much as is allowed within

56 Hellebore is a plant that was supposed to cure insanity.

57 Cyril of Alexandria (c. 376–444) was involved in the Christological controversies and the main opponent of Nestorius of Constantinople. Among his exegetical writings is a commentary on the Gospel of John. On Cyril and Nestorius see *SPT* 19.30, note 44.

58 Rivetus seems to refer to Arminius's friend Petrus Bertius (1565–1629) who published *Hymenaeus desertor, sive De sanctorum apostasia problemata duo* (Leiden: Joannes Patius, 1601). After the Synod of Dort he was dismissed and went to France, where he converted to the Roman Catholic Church and for that reason was officially excommunicated by the consistory of Leiden.

59 Cf. the *Canons of Dort* V, 1–5.

quantum ad gratiosas Christi promissiones, fidelem Spiritus Sancti custodiam, et immutabile* Dei consilium de iis salvandis. Nam si vires Satanae spectemus, et fidelium infirmitates, si sibi relinquerentur, tunc palam fatemur, posse eos quovis momento excidere et perire. Fidem etiam amittere et gratia excidere eatenus negamus, ita nimirum ut infideles fiant et Dei hostes, sicut non renati peccatores; quia Deus cum illis non agit stricto jure, etiamsi paternam ejus indignationem incurrant, reatum damnabilem contrahant, praesentem ad regnum coelorum ingrediendum aptitudinem amittant, si in se* considerentur; et in illo interstitio ante fidei ac poenitentiae actum* renovatum, talem peccatorem, etsi electum, damnationis meritum circumferre concedimus, etsi firmo Dei proposito in Christo sit absolvendus; sed postquam ex Dei ordinatione et gratia redierit in viam, per renovatum fidei et obedientiae actum secundum, cujus actus primus, semen regenerationis, sartum tectum conservatur; cum fundamentalibus illis donis, sine quibus vita spiritualis non consistit, idque non ex hominum fidelium arbitrio* et voluntate,* sed ex speciali Dei amore, divina operatione, Christique intercessione et custodia.

XXXIX Et haec quidem de materia perseverantiae quae subjecti* rationem habet. Objectum autem ejusdem sunt promissiones gratiae divinae. Quae non tantum habent certitudinem in promittente et in se ipsis, sed etiam certae sunt perseveranti; inter quas etiam promissiones, ea quae de perseverantia est, continetur, quae cum certa sit in se, non tantum quibusdam fidelibus ex speciali privilegio ejus certitudinem specialem indultam esse, sed etiam quemvis fidelium, et debere et posse* certo esse persuasum de electione et perseverantia sua, non dubitamus asserere, iisdem argumentis innitentes, quibus antea fidei de reconciliatione nostra certitudinem probavimus* thesi 30. et seqq. Promanat enim certitudo perseverantiae, ex ipsa specialis fidei natura,* utpote quae fertur non tantum actu* directo in rem* promissam, sed et actu reflexo in suam

the gracious promises of Christ, the faithful safekeeping of the Holy Spirit, and God's unchangeable* decree concerning their salvation. For we openly admit that, considering Satan's powers and the infirmities of believers, if they should be left to themselves then they could fall away and perish at any moment. But we deny that believers also lose their faith, or fall away from grace to the point that they actually become unbelievers and enemies of God, like sinners who have not been born again. For God does not treat them strictly according to the Law, even though they incur his fatherly displeasure, and they bring upon themselves a liability to damnation and lose their present aptitude for entering the kingdom of heaven if they are considered only in and of themselves.* And we grant that in that interval, before the act* of faith and repentance is renewed, such a sinner, although he is elect, does go about deserving damnation, even though by God's firm decree in Christ he will be declared innocent. But after, by God's decree and grace, he will have returned to the right way, through a renewed, second act of faith and obedience—the first act of which is the seed of regeneration—, he is preserved fully restored with those fundamental gifts without which the spiritual life does not exist. And this renewal comes not by the decision* or will* of believers but by the special love of God and the divine operation and the intercession and safe-keeping of Christ.

So much, then, for the material of perseverance, which has the role of being 39
its subject.* But the object of perseverance are the promises of divine grace. The certainty of these promises rests not only in the one who makes the promises, and in the promises themselves, but they are also certain to the persevering person. Included in these promises there is also the one about perseverance; since this promise is certain in itself and not only by some special privilege for certain believers, we do not doubt to state that each and every believer both should and is able* to be convinced about his own election and perseverance, and we rely on the same arguments with which earlier we have proved* the certainty of faith about our reconciliation, in thesis 30 and following. For the certainty of perseverance flows forth from the very nature* of the special faith[60] that is not only related to the thing* promised by a direct act* but also by a reflexive act is directed to consciousness of itself.[61] Therefore each and every

60 On 'special faith' see thesis 21 above.

61 A direct act of the mind has an external object that is independent of the mind, e.g. "I know a house." A reflexive act of the mind has an act of the mind as its object, e.g. "I know that I know a house." In post-Reformation theology the distinction between a direct and an indirect act became one of the means for articulating the relation between saving faith and one's personal assurance of having that faith; see Joel Beeke, *The Quest for Full Assurance:*

apprehensionem; quapropter quivis fidelis qui de intimo fidei suae actu certus est, fidei quoque suae certissimam conservationem firmiter credere potest.

XL Hoc fundamentum* etsi unusquisque fidelis semper in se habeat, fatemur tamen, non semper in actum* exire hanc fidei persuasionem. Quae etiam cum in actum exit, non habet illum certitudinis gradum, qui omnem contrarii formidinem perpetuo excludat; sed aliquando vivida est fides, aliquando languida, aliquando in gravissimis tentationibus actum* suum non exserit, in quibus fideles hanc fidei πληροφορίαν et perseverantiae certitudinem non semper sentiunt, quos tamen Deus Pater consolationum, *supra vires tentari non sinit, sed cum tentatione praestat evasionem*, 1 Cor. 10, 13. ac per Spiritum suum facit tandem ut eluctentur, et in iis actus* ille velut emortuus reviviscat, qui non est incertae opinationis, aut spei conjecturalis, sed verae et vivae fidei per adoptionis Spiritum in ejus corde excitatae et obsignatae.

XLI Finis* perseverantiae proximus, est fidelium salus, in qua de victoria ab hostibus reportata, triumphum agunt perpetuum. Ultimus est gloria gratiae* et potentiae* Dei, ad quam qui vere credunt, quicquid in se praesentis boni agnoscunt, aut futuri exspectant, humiliter referunt. Ex quo intelligi potest, quam contumeliose sanctae huic doctrinae affingant nonnulli, quod ex natura* sua verae pietati noxia sit, et toti religioni* perniciosa. Quasi vero contra religionem aliquid molirentur, qui *praesumunt non de operatione sua, sed de Christi gratia*. Nos potius Augustinum audimus dicentem, *Non hic*[a] *arrogantia est, sed fides, praedicare quod acceperis; non est superbia, sed devotio. De verb. Dom. sec. Luc. Serm*. 28.[b]

XLII Perseverantiae certitudinis effecta vel consequentia, in hac vita sunt spei nostrae firmitas et perpetuitas, unionisque nostrae cum Christo confirmatio, et vinculi caritatis et pacis, quo Sancti inter se vinciuntur, firmior et tenacior astrictio; in futura vero, plena salutis et perfectae beatitudinis possessio, et perpetuus Sanctorum, cum Christo capite, triumphus. In utroque: aeterna divinae caritatis erga nos duratio, et amoris nostri erga Deum non interrupta perpetuitas; Ejusdem in nobis servatis, gloriae manifestatio; nostri, in eo qui nos servavit et glorificavit in perpetuum, nunquam cessatura gloriatio.

---

[a] haec: 1642. [b] Augustine, *Sermo LXXXIV* (MPL 39:1908). This sermon was attributed traditionally to Augustine; however, it appears to have been copied from Ambrose's book on the sacraments. For the numbering of Augustine's sermons, see *SPT* 34.8, nota a.

The Legacy of Calvin and His Successors (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1999), 1 and *passim*.

believer who is certain of the inward act of his faith is able to believe steadfastly in the surest preservation of his own faith.

Although each and every believer always has this basis* within himself, we still admit that this assurance of the faith does not always actually* come out. And even when it does, it does not have that degree of certainty which uninterruptedly excludes all dread of the opposite; but sometimes faith is alive and well, at other times it is feeble, and sometimes it does not show its full actuality in the face of very serious temptations, temptations wherein believers do not always feel the full assurance and certainty of persevering. And yet in the end God, the father of all consolation, "does not permit them to be tempted beyond their strength, but with the temptation He provides a way of escape" (1Corinthians 10:13), and through his Spirit He sees to it that they surmount the hardship. And in the midst of those temptations that act* of faith, as though dead, is revived, and it does not consist of an uncertain opinion or some speculative hope, but of true, living faith that is aroused and sealed by the Spirit of adoption in one's heart. 40

The proximate* goal* of perseverance is the salvation of the believers, salvation wherein they conduct a continuous triumph for the victory that has been obtained over the enemy. The ultimate goal is the glory of God's grace* and power,* the grace to which all true believers humbly attribute whatever present good they observe in themselves and whatever future good they look forward to. And from this one can understand how wrong it is that some people falsely make up the story that this holy teaching by its very nature* is harmful to genuine piety and deadly for the whole of religion*—as if those people "who presume not upon their own works but upon the grace of Christ" could mount any threat at all against religion. As for us, we prefer to listen to Augustine, when he says: "To declare publicly what you have received is not arrogance, but faith; it isn't haughtiness, but devotion" (*On the Words of the Lord according to Luke*, Sermon 28). 41

In this life, the effects or consequences of the certainty of perseverance are the constant endurance of our hope, the confirmation of our bond with Christ, and a stronger, tighter fastening of the bond of love and peace that binds saints together. And in the future life the effects will be the full possession of salvation and perfect happiness, and a perpetual triumph of the saints together with Christ their head. And in both lives it is the everlasting duration of God's love towards us, and an unbroken perpetuity of our love towards God. And, the manifestation of God's glory in those of us who are saved, and our never-ending praise of him who has saved us and glorified us forever. 42

DISPUTATIO XXXII

De Resipiscentia[a]

Praeside D. ANTONIO WALAEO
Respondente ADRIANO JANSONIO

THESIS I Quum tota praedicationis Evangelicae summa, fide constet et resipiscentia, atque antecedenti disputatione de Fide sit actum; consequitur, ut de altero Evangelicae praedicationis membro, nempe Resipiscentia, deinceps agamus.

II Resipiscentia haec duobus modis* considerari solet, vel quatenus est habitus* spiritualis nobis per Spiritum Dei infusus, vel quatenus est actio a nobis ex habitu illo procedens. Priori modo proprie* et stricte regeneratio vocatur, posteriori modo strictius sumpta Resipiscentia, vel poenitentia, utrumque vero conjunctim, circumcisio cordis, conversio ad Deum, renovatio spiritus, sanctificatio hominis, nova creatura, et resurrectio prima appellatur.

III De utroque hoc beneficio conjunctim considerato nonnulla primum explicabimus; deinde speciatim de poenitentia proprie* dicta et ejus proprietatibus agemus.

[a] The *Opera omnia* of Walaeus contain an identical version of the "Disputatio de Resipiscentia" (*Opera* 2:341–344). A more elaborate discussion is provided in the chapter "De Resipiscentia" in Walaeus's *Loci communes* (*Opera* 1:431–444).

DISPUTATION 32

On Repentance

President: Antonius Walaeus
Respondent: Adrianus Jansonius[1]

Since the main point in the preaching of the Gospel consists of faith and repentance, and as we have dealt with faith in the previous disputation, it follows now that we should treat the second element, namely, repentance.[2] 1

It is customary to consider this repentance in two ways:* either as a spiritual disposition* poured into our hearts by the Holy Spirit, or as an action from us that proceeds from that disposition. In the first way, it is properly* speaking and in its strict sense called regeneration; in the second way, it is called repentance, taken in a more restricted sense, or penitence. And when the two are taken together it is called the circumcision of the heart, the conversion to God, the renewal of the Spirit, the sanctification of man, the new creation, and the first resurrection.[3] 2

First we shall offer some explanations of the two benefits considered jointly, and then we shall deal in particular with penitence (in the strict sense*) and its properties. 3

---

1 This disputation was defended in 1622. Probably Adrianus Jansonius is the same as Adrianus Johannis—as both names can mean son of John—born in Vlissingen in 1598 who matriculated on September 27, 1618 in theology. He was ordained in Colijnsplaat and Kats in 1625 and in Koudekerke 1632. He died in 1651. See Du Rieu, *Album studiosorum*, 137 and Van Lieburg, *Repertorium*, 112.

2 *Resipiscentia* (*poenitentia*, repentance) is a favorite term in the theology of spirituality. In classical Latin *resipiscere* means to become wise (*sapiens*) again. Christian authors also develop the meaning 'to repent.' According to Walaeus (see thesis 2 below), *resipiscentia* has two modes: *resipiscentia* in the broad sense—including *regeneratio* in the strict sense—and *resipiscentia* in the strict sense of repentance. Repentance in a broad sense denotes the whole set of life changes worked by the Holy Spirit in the believer; as a subset of this complete life change one can distinguish the 'repentance' in a strict sense, as the initial moment of return to God. See also thesis 41 below. In classical Latin *regenerare* means to reproduce, whereas Christian authors also develop the meaning to regenerate, to elicit rebirth. In this disputation Walaeus first deals with the combination of regeneration and repentance, and second with *resipiscentia* in the strict sense.

3 Romans 2:29, 1 Thessalonians 1:9, Titus 3:5, 1 Thessalonians 4:3, 2 Corinthians 5:17, Revelations 20:6, and other places. In *De civitate Dei* 20.6 (CCSL 48, 707–708), Augustine interprets the 'first resurrection' mentioned in Revelation 20 as a 'spiritual' resurrection in which the believers are no longer bound by sin.

IV Causa* principalis efficiens est Deus per Spiritum suum, *nisi enim quis regenitus sit ex aqua et Spiritu, non potest ingredi in regnum Dei*, Joh. 3,5. et quemadmodum Deus evexit ad dextram suam auctorem vitae et conservatorem, *ad dandam Israëli resipiscentiam*, Act. 5, 31. ita quoque Ecclesia Israëlitica glorificavit Deum, *quod et Gentibus Deus resipiscentiam dedisset ad vitam*, Act. 11, 18.

V Causa* meritoria hujus doni non est ulla nostra antecedens dispositio, aut praeparatio, aut melior nostri naturalis* arbitrii* usus, quemadmodum nonnulli perperam sentiunt, nam *postquam benignitas, et erga homines amor apparuit Servatoris nostri Dei, non ex operibus quae in justitia fecerimus nos, sed ex sua misericordia servavit nos, per lavacrum regenerationis, et renovationis Spiritus Sancti, quem effudit in nos copiose per Jesum Christum*, quemadmodum loquitur Apostolus Tit. 3, 4. 5. et 6.

VI Nec tamen negamus, quin ipse Deus ordinarie quidem variis modis,* tum per naturae* documenta, Rom. 2, 4., tum per verbum* Legis et Evangelii, homines paulatim praeparet, priusquam hujus beneficii eos participes reddat, ut postea explicabitur; sed negamus primo, Deum ad hunc ordinarium agendi modum* obligari, ut in latrone cum Christo crucifixo, et Paulo Christi Ecclesiam persequente apparet; deinde hanc ejusmodi praeparationem esse aut dispositionem, quae vel ex congruo ejusmodi donum mereatur, ut locus Tit. 3, 5. antea citatus demonstrat;* denique ullam ejusmodi dispositionem aut praeparationem, quae fidem antecedat, esse praeviam, cui hujus doni certa promissio a Deo sit facta, cum *quicquid non est ex fide, peccatum sit*, Rom. 14, 23. et *sine fide impossibile sit placere Deo*, nempe ad salutem, Heb. 11, 6.

VII Adeo ut homini, utcunque jam disposito, haec gratia* sit indebita, cum etiam in hac quacunque dispositione homo sit reus condemnationis; quae

The principal, effective cause* is God through his Spirit, for "unless one is born again of the water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John 3:5), and just as God raised "the author and preserver of life" to his right hand "in order to give repentance to Israel" (Acts 5:31), so too did the Israelite church glorify God "because God has given also to the gentiles repentance unto life" (Acts 11:18). 4

The meritorious cause*[4] of this gift is not any prior disposition of our own, or preparation we have done, or some superior exercise of our natural* ability* to judge (as some people wrongly think); for "when the kindness of God our Savior and his love for mankind appeared, he saved us, not because of works done by us in righteousness, but according to his own mercy, by the washing of regeneration and renewal of the Holy Spirit, whom he poured out upon us richly through Jesus Christ our Savior," as the apostle says in Titus 3:4–6. 5

We do not deny, however, that before He makes people partakers of this benefit, God himself ordinarily uses various ways* to prepare them for it, a little at a time, whether through proofs evident in the natural* world (Romans 2:4) or through the word* of the Law and the Gospel, as we shall explain below. But we do deny that God is bound to behave in this ordinary way;* this is clear from the case of the robber who was crucified with Christ,[5] and of Paul when he was persecuting the Church.[6] And we also deny that there is some sort of preparation or disposition that earns this kind of gift on the basis of congruity,[7] for that is shown* in Titus 3:5, a passage we have cited earlier. And lastly, we deny that any sort of disposition or preparation that precedes faith is a precursor to which God has attached a sure promise for this gift, for "whatever is not from faith is sin" (Romans 14:23) and "without faith it is impossible to please God," that is, to please him to one's own salvation (Hebrews 11:6). 6

And we even state that this grace* is undeserved for any man, regardless of the extent he has been predisposed; because whatever his disposition, man is guilty of condemnation. For no-one is released from this condemnation "except 7

4 A 'meritorious cause' is "an intermediate or instrumental cause that contributes to a desired effect by rendering the effect worthy of taking place" (*DGLTT*, s.v. "causa meritoria"). Note that the causal language employed here by the *Synopsis* reflects the elaborate causal framework in which the Tridentine "Decree on Justification" (DH 1520–1583) describes the doctrine of salvation.

5 Luke 23:40–43.

6 Acts 9:1–19.

7 The expression "gift on the basis of congruity" evokes the distinction between "condign merit" and "congruous merit." See the discussion in *SPT* 31.35, note 51; 33 antithesis 3; 34.38, and *DLGTT* s.v. "meritum de congruo."

condemnatio non tollitur nisi *ab iis qui sunt in Christo, et qui non ambulant secundum carnem, sed secundum spiritum*, Rom. 8, 1.

VIII Interim vero et hoc asserimus, eos qui documentis naturae,* vel Legis et Evangelii, ad resipiscentiam vocantibus resistunt, vel ea in injustitia detinent, per hoc factum suum novum sibi reatum et condemnationis gradum arcessere, ac sic in Dei judicio magis ac magis inexcusabiles fieri, ut idem Apostolus docet, Rom. 1, 20. et c. 2, 1. item Joh. 15, 22.

IX Causa* προκαταρκτικὴ hujus utriusque beneficii, regenerationis nempe et resipiscentiae, est Christi mors et resurrectio, ut Apostolus perspicue docet, Rom. 6, 3. et Hebr. 9, 14. et Petrus, 1. Epist. 1, 18. 19. etc. Quum enim Christus nos per mortem suam a peccatis servarit, non ut peccato, sed ut ipsi serviremus, necessarium quoque fuit, ut mors ejus, et resurrectio efficax esset ad veterem hominem mortificandum, et novum vivificandum; unde et summa votorum Apostoli et ad ejus exemplum omnium vere fidelium haec est, non tantum, *ut reperiantur in Christo, non habentes suam justitiam, quae est ex lege, sed eam quae est ex fide Christi, justitiam ex Deo per fidem*, sed insuper, *ut cognoscant eum, vim resurrectionis ejus, et communionem passionum ejus, conformati morti ejus*, Phil. 3, 10.

X Causa* instrumentalis hujus beneficii est Verbum* Dei, tum Legis, tum Evangelii.

XI Per Legem enim tam naturae* inscriptam, Rom. 1. quam lapideis tabulis renovatam, 2 Cor. 3. homo ad veram condemnationis et miseriae suae agnitionem perducitur, ut alibi explicatum est; sine qua homo regenerationis et resipiscentiae salutaris capax esse non potest, cum Christus ipse testetur, *se non venisse ut justos, sed peccatores ad resipiscentiam vocaret*, Matt. 9, 13.

XII Per Evangelium vero et promissiones ejus, dolor secundum Deum concipitur, conscientia afflicta in spem veniae erigitur, Christus denique apprehenditur, non tantum in remissionem antecedentium peccatorum, sed abolitionem

only those who are in Christ, and who do not walk according to the flesh but according to the Spirit" (Romans 8:1, 4).

8 At the same time we state also that those who refuse to accept the proofs evident in the natural* world or in the Law and the Gospel that call them to repentance, or who suppress them by their wickedness, by so doing bring yet another guilt upon themselves and a new degree of condemnation, and so they are more and more without excuse in the judgment of God, as the same apostle teaches us (Romans 1:20, 2:1; John 15:22).

9 The initiating cause*[8] of the double benefit of regeneration and repentance is the death and resurrection of Christ, as the apostle teaches clearly in Romans 6:3, Hebrews 9:14, 1 Peter 1:18–19, etc. For since through his death Christ has saved us from our sins that we might be servants not of sin[9] but of Christ, it was necessary also that his death and resurrection could effectively put the old man to death and cause the new one to live. And the main point of the apostle's prayers (and, following his example, the main point of all believers' prayers) is not merely that "they may be found in Christ, not having a righteousness of their own that comes from the law, but one that is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which comes from God by faith." But above and beyond that the prayer is "that they might know Christ and the power of his resurrection and the fellowship of his sufferings, and be conformed to his death" (Philippians 3:9–10).

10 The instrumental cause* of this benefit is the Word* of God, both that of the Law and that of the Gospel.

11 For it is by the Law, as recorded in nature* (Romans 1) and as renewed on the stone tablets (2 Corinthians 3) that man is led to truly realize his own condemnation and wretched state, as was explained elsewhere.[10] If he does not realize this, man cannot possibly grasp the regeneration and repentance that bring salvation, since Christ himself bears witness "that he has not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance" (Matthew 9:13).[11]

12 But it is through the Gospel and its promises that man conceives a godly sorrow, lifts up his downcast conscience to hope for forgiveness, and then makes Christ his own. He does so not only for the forgiveness of prior sins, but

---

8 The death and resurrection of Christ, as the external impelling cause or the initiating cause of regeneration, are not only a model for but also induct the 'death and resurrection' of the believers.

9 The Latin text contains a word play between *servare* (to save) and *servire* (to serve).

10 See also *SPT* 23.5–7 for this function of the Law, as opposite to the Gospel.

11 In the quotation from Matthew 9:13, the *Synopsis* follows the *Textus Receptus* that—unlike most modern editions—has *eis metanoian*, 'to repentance.'

quoque veteris et resuscitationem novi hominis: unde et Evangelium *ministerium Spiritus et vitae* appellatur, 2 Cor. 3. et *semen immortale Dei in aeternum manens, per quod regignimur*, 1 Pet. 1, 23. et Jac. 1, 18.

XIII Forma regenerationis et resipiscentiae consistit in mortificatione veteris hominis, seu abolitione corruptionis nativae; et restauratione novi hominis, qui secundum Deum creatus est in justitia et sanctitate vera, Eph. 4. et Col. 3. quae forma, veteris hominis naturam* non tantum reprimit, ut quidam male sentiunt, sed etiam abolet, et veram sanctitatem ac justitiam ejus loco substituit, quae in ipsis resipiscentiae fructibus quoque resplendet.

XIV Haec autem forma, si ultimam perfectionem* ejus spectes, non simul et semel introducitur, sed per gradus, unde et quidam regeniti pueris, quidam vero viris adultis et perfectis comparantur, Hebr. 5. et Eph. 4.

XV Quemadmodum vero pueri, etsi imperfectius eam exserunt, integram tamen hominis formam, omnibus suis partibus constantem habent, sic neminem vere resipiscentem aut regenitum agnoscimus, nisi qui formam integram regenerationis possidet, perfectione,* ut loquuntur, partium, etsi quotidie ei sit proficiendum in perfectione graduum.

XVI Perfectio* haec essentialis* consistit, primum in eo, ut omnes facultates* animae humanae renoventur, intellectus, voluntas* et affectus,* secundum omnia praecepta Dei; deinde ut eousque renoventur, ut *peccatum in iis*

also for doing away with the old man and bringing to life the new one. For this reason the Gospel is called "the ministry of the Spirit and of life" (2 Corinthians 3[:8–10]) and "the immortal seed of God that remains forever, through which we are born again" (1 Peter 1:23; James 1:18).

The form of regeneration and repentance consists of the dying of the old 13
man, or the abolition of his innate corrupt nature; it also consists of the restoration of the new man who is created in true righteousness and holiness after God (Ephesians 4[:22–24], Colossians 3[:8–12]).[12] And this form not only keeps the nature* of the old man in check (as some wrongly think),[13] but it even does away with it entirely, and puts in its place true holiness and righteousness which also shines forth in the very fruits of repentance.

If one considers this form from the perspective of its ultimate, completed* 14
state, it is not brought about all at once, but rather by degrees, and for this reason some who have been born again are likened to children, while others are likened to fully grown adults (Hebrews 5[:13–14]; Ephesians 4[:13–16]).

But just as children do possess the whole form[14] of a human being and all the 15
parts that comprise it, and although they display it in a somewhat imperfect way, so too do we consider no-one to be truly repentant or born again unless he has the whole form of regeneration, in the perfection* of parts (as the expression has it), although he must make daily progress in the perfection of degrees.[15]

This essential* perfection* consists firstly in the renewal of all the faculties* 16
of the human soul, the intellect, the will,* and the affections,* according to all of God's precepts. Secondly it consists in their renewal to the point that "sin no

12 The notion of 'form' (*forma*) is used in a twofold sense in this disputation. The explanation in thesis 13 focuses on the linguistic aspect: what is the (formal) definition of resipiscence that reflects its nature or essence? In thesis 15 below, we meet a use of *forma* which is more akin to the traditional philosophical usage: the *form* (*forma*) of a human person is the nature or essence of that human person: being human or the humanity. This second notion of *forma* rests on the duality of *form* and *matter*: every form is embodied in matter.

13 These "some" could not be identified.

14 See thesis 13, note 12 above.

15 For 'perfection of parts' and 'perfection of degrees,' see Van Asselt and Van den Brink, *Scholastic Discourse*, 238–239, 310–311. There the distinction between "perfection of essential parts" and "perfection of degrees" is placed alongside the distinction between 'essential' and 'quantitative' perfection. An application of this distinction by Johannes Maccovius is related to the regenerate's good works that are perfect in the sense that the essential parts are present, though they are not perfect in degree.

non regnet, Rom. 6. et *ut non ambulent secundum carnem, sed secundum spiritum*, Rom. 8, 1.

XVII Etsi vero regnum Spiritus in quibusdam sit imbecillius et obscurius, in quibusdam firmius et manifestius: negamus tamen, quemquam inter regenitos eousque in hac vita pervenisse, ut nullae veteris hominis reliquiae amplius in eo supersint. Unde et quotidie illis orandum est, *Remitte nobis debita nostra*, et resipiscentiae novi actus* per veram in Christum fidem quotidie excitandi.

XVIII Subjectum* regenerationis hujus, est totus homo Christo per fidem insitus aut inserendus, *Fide enim purificantur corda nostra*, Act. 15, 9. Quemadmodum tamen principale peccati subjectum est anima hominis, omnibus suis facultatibus* naturalibus* instructa, corpus vero minus principale, tamquam animae sedes et instrumentum; ita et regenerationis propria sedes et subjectum principale est eadem anima, secundum omnes facultates* suas, intellectum, voluntatem* et affectus:* quae omnes facultates in vera et salutari regeneratione et resipiscentia, supernaturali* et inhaerente gratia a Deo per Spiritum, et quidem actione immediata,* magis ac magis afficiuntur.

XIX De intellectu, quod per hoc beneficium in cognitionem Dei et Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi illuminetur, res est perspicua; de affectibus,* quod in odium peccati ac Satanae, in amorem Dei et justitiae, in spem vitae et haereditatis aeternae, etc. per idem donum excitentur, nemo non agnoscit, ac proinde ampliori probatione* non eget. Quia tamen sunt nonnulli, qui voluntatem* hac regenerationis inhaerente gratia affici negare audent, nonnullis argumentis id nobis breviter est confirmandum.

longer reigns in them"[16] (Romans 6[:12]) and that they "do not walk according to the flesh but according to the Spirit" (Romans 8:1).

For even though the rule of the Spirit is weaker and less visible in some people while more established and evident in others, we deny that any regenerate person has reached the point in this life where no remnants of the old man still live in him any longer. For this reason those who are born again must pray every day "forgive us our sins," and daily they must produce new deeds* of repentance by their true faith in Christ. 17

The subject* of this regeneration is the entire man who has been (or is to be) planted in Christ through faith, for "it is by faith that our hearts are cleansed" (Acts 15:9). And just as the principal subject of sin is the soul of man, fitted out with all its natural* faculties* (while the body is a less principal subject, as the seat or instrument of the soul), so too that same soul, with all its faculties,* including intellect, will* and affections,* is the proper seat and principal subject of regeneration. And in the true regeneration and repentance that lead to salvation all these faculties are more and more affected by the supernatural* and inherent grace that comes from God through the Spirit, an action that is direct and immediate.* 18

As far as the intellect is concerned, this process is obvious, because by this benefit [of regeneration and repentance] it is enlightened unto the knowledge of God and our Savior Jesus Christ.[17] And concerning the affections, no further proof* is required, because everyone acknowledges that the same gift stirs the affections* to hate sin and Satan, to love God and righteousness, and to hope for eternal life and the inheritance. Regarding the will,* however, since there are some who dare to say that the inherent grace of regeneration does not affect the will,[18] we shall have to establish the proof of it briefly with a few arguments. 19

16 Cf. the distinction between 'reigning sins' and 'non-reigning sins' explained in *SPT* 16.39–46.

17 Ephesians 1:17–18.

18 The question is whether the operation of God's effective grace on the human will is merely 'moral,' presenting the Gospel promise to the intellect with the result that the will follows the intellect in accepting it, or that this operation has a stronger, 'physical' character directly applying to the will itself. The *Canons of Dort*, III/IV, rejection of errors 6 and 7, explicitly deal with the question of the 'moral' versus 'physical' character of regenerating grace. The discussion here may be a continuation of the implicit polemic against the view expressed in *SPT* 31.9 above by Paul Testard, who was a pupil of John Cameron; see *SPT* 31.9, note 15 for a fuller explanation. Either directly or through Testard, Walaeus might have known the views developed by Cameron around 1618. Apart from the identification of John Cameron as a possible reference, one could think in a broader sense of the Molinist side of the so-called *De Auxiliis* controversy; cf. *SPT* 31.35, note 52.

XX Primum hoc demonstro ex corruptione voluntatis* antecedanea, nam quicquid spiritualiter corruptum est, hac spirituali genitura renovatur ac corrigitur; voluntatem autem hominis naturalis* in se et per se esse corruptam, multis in locis Scriptura asserit. Vide Eph. 2, 3. et 1 Pet. 4, 3. unde et Apostolus Rom. 7, 19. inquit, *se non facere bonum quod vult, sed facere malum quod non vult.* Et v. 21. *Comperio, mihi volenti facere bonum, hanc legem, quod mihi malum adjaceat*, ostendens, se voluntate,* qua regenita est, bonum spirituale quidem appetere; propter inhaerentes tamen ei carnis reliquias, non ita efficaciter et plene velle, ut effectus ille, quem optet et velit, semper consequatur.

XXI Secundo demonstratur* illud ex ipsa spirituali qualitate* quae per regenerationem introducitur, nam non tantum caritas et fiducia in Deum in voluntate* suam sedem habent, sed etiam sanctitas et justitia novi hominis, Eph. 4, 24. est propria voluntatis* affectio, ut omnes Ethici agnoscunt, unde Jurisconsulti eam definiunt *constantem voluntatem* unicuique suum tribuendi.*

XXII Tertio, modi loquendi quibus passim Scriptura in hoc negotio utitur, id ipsum efficaciter evincunt. Nam quando Deus dicitur Spiritum novum ponere in medio nostri, cor circumcidere, cor novum in nobis creare, cor lapideum ac durum reddere carneum, praeputium cordis auferre, et similia plurima, de solo inferiori appetitu, quem homo cum bestiis habet communem,* a nemine unquam explicata sunt; nec de intellectu immediate* intelligi possunt, quia nullus dabitur in Scriptura locus, ubi intellectus durus aut lapideus vocatur, aut intellectus circumcidi, aut praeputium ejus tolli, aut in nobis denuo creari dicitur. Contra vero, cum de intellectu agit Scriptura, eum caecum et obtenebratum appellare solet; et renovationem ejus, illuminationem oculorum mentis,

I show this first from the prior corruption of the will,* for this spiritual generation renews and corrects everything that has been corrupted on the spiritual level. And Scripture states in many places that the natural* man's will was corrupted entirely in and of itself; see Ephesians 2:3, and 1 Peter 4:3. For this reason also the apostle says "that he does not do the good that he wants, but the evil that he does not want to do" (Romans 7:19), and "I find this law, that when I want to do good evil lies close at hand" (Romans 7:21). He shows that it is by his will,* insofar as it was regenerated, that he even seeks after the spiritual good, but that on account of the remnants of the flesh that still cling to him he does not will it so effectively and fully that he always achieves the result that he wishes and wills. 20

In the second place it is demonstrated* by the very spiritual quality* that is brought on by regeneration. For not only do love and trust in God have their proper place in the will,* but so too the holiness and righteousness of the new man (Ephesians 4:24) is a proper affection of the will,* as all the ethical philosophers admit.[19] It is for this reason that the lawyers define righteousness as "the constant willingness* to grant to everyone his due." 21

Thirdly, it is proved effectively by the ways in which the Scriptures everywhere speak about this matter. For when it says that God places a new Spirit within us,[20] or that He circumcises the heart,[21] creates in us a new heart,[22] turns our hard hearts of stone into hearts of flesh,[23] removes the foreskin of our hearts,[24] and many similar things, no-one has ever explained them as concerning only the baser appetites that we have in common* with animals. Nor can these be taken directly* to mean the intellect, since no place will be found in Scripture where it is the intellect that is called hard or stony, or where it says that it is the intellect that is circumcised, or that its foreskin is removed, or that it is being created anew in us. To the contrary, when the intellect is treated in Scripture, it is usually called blind or darkened; and the renewal of the intellect 22

19 The ethicists—quoted here for their definition of 'righteousness' (*iustitia*)—are the thinkers who mainly follow Aristotle's *Ethica Nicomachea*, which was a crucial text in legal studies. For the definition of righteousness quoted from the 'lawyers,' see Johannes Altenstaig, *Lexicon theologicum* (Cologne: Henning, 1619), s.v. "iustitia secundum alios." In his *Compendium of Aristotelian Ethics* of 1620 Walaeus offers the same Aristotelian definition of 'righteousness' that is quoted here, Walaeus, *Opera* 2:288b. For the *Compendium* see *SPT* 24.40, note 30.

20 Ezekiel 36:26.

21 Deuteronomy 30:6; Romans 2:29.

22 Psalm 51:10.

23 Ezekiel 36:26.

24 Deuteronomy 10:16.

inscriptionem legis in cordibus; ablationem velaminis a cordibus, donationem mentis, etc.

XXIII Demonstrant* illud denique Sanctorum vota et preces. Nam *quum Deus is sit, qui in nobis efficit et velle et perficere pro bona sua voluntate*, Phil. 2, 13. quis ausit sentire, quin praeter mentis illuminationem ac affectuum* correctionem, voluntatis* quoque renovatio, atque in bonum spirituale inclinatio postulari debeat? Exemplo Davidis, Ps. 119, 36. Praesertim cum fieri non possit,* ut voluntas solis naturae* viribus instructa, intellectum supernaturali* dono jam affectum per se sequatur, aut ut intellectus aliquam inhaerentem sibi supernaturalem* qualitatem* per se voluntati* imprimat; cum hoc solius Spiritus Dei esse Scriptura ubique asserat, et non magis intellectus ejusmodi vim voluntati possit* per se imprimere, quam ipsam voluntatem ex se producere; sed sicuti Deus tam facultatem* intellectus quam voluntatis in homine creavit, sic dona supernaturalia* tam huic quam illi per novam illam creationem superaddit.

XXIV Nec vero ad actiones spirituales ex hoc spirituali habitu* producendas sufficit sola initialis hujus doni collatio, aut habitualis possessio; sed quemadmodum gratia* praeveniens et operans hoc donum in nobis primo effecit, sic opus est, ut gratia* concomitans et cooperans illud idem ad actiones resipiscentia dignas excitet, et quotidie magis ac magis perficiat. Nam *qui praevenit nolentem ut velit, subsequitur volentem ne frustra velit*.[a]

XXV Inde est quod Christus discipulis suis dicit, *ipsos sine ipso nihil posse, et omnem palmitem in ipso ferentem fructus purgare, ut plures fructus proferat*,

[a] Augustine, *Enchiridion* 9.32 (CCSL 46:67).

is called the enlightening of the eyes of the mind, the writing of the Law upon the hearts, the removal of the veil from our hearts, and the gift of a new mind.

And finally, it is proved* by the vows and prayers of the saints. For "since it 23
is God who works in us both to will and to act according to his own good will" (Philippians 2:13), who would dare to think that apart from the illumination of the mind and the amendment of our affections* it is not necessary to ask for the renewal of the will* and an inclination towards the spiritual good? Take David, for example, in Psalm 119:36.[25] Especially because it is not possible* that the will, equipped with only natural* powers, of its own accord follows the intellect that has already been affected by the supernatural* gift, or that the intellect impresses the will* with some inherent supernatural* quality.* For Scripture everywhere states clearly that this comes only from the Spirit of God, and that the intellect is no more capable* of impressing such power upon the will than it can produce the will itself on its own. But just as it is God who has created in man the faculty* of the intellect and the faculty of the will, so also is it upon the one as well as the other faculty that he grants the additional supernatural* gifts through that new creation.

And in order to produce spiritual actions from this spiritual condition* it 24
is not sufficient to have only the initial conferment or habitual possession of this gift. But just as preceding and operating grace*[26] first produces this gift in our hearts, so too is it necessary that the accompanying, co-operating grace* similarly stir up that gift for actions that are worthy of repentance and make the will more and more perfect every day. For "He who goes before the unwilling so that he wills, follows him when he is willing, so that he does not will in vain." (Augustine, *Enchiridion* 32).[27]

For this reason Christ says to his disciples that "they can do nothing without 25
him, and that he prunes every branch in him that bears fruit that it may bear

---

25 "Turn my heart toward your statutes, and not toward selfish gain" (NIV).

26 The various terms used in this sentence describe the ways in which God's grace operates on us in the process of repentance. Grace is as such *prevenient* (*praeveniens*), because the whole of the reality of faith and salvation rests on God's grace. In this way, we can also understand that the notions of preparatory grace and prevenient grace are intimately linked. Of course, grace is active (*operans*). *Gratia cooperans* presupposes a specific situation: grace (*gratia praeveniens*) opens the heart of the new believer and creates new life of faith, and then co-operative grace (*gratia cooperans*) is active in the believer who lives by faith. Our will, which is initially renewed, does not produce the acts of repentance on its own, but only when these acts are elicited in us by God's grace. This aspect of grace is also accompanying grace (*gratia concomitans*).

27 This part of the disputation resembles Augustine's *Enchiridion*, e.g. in citing Bible passages such as Philippians 2:13 in thesis 23 above.

Joh. 15, 2. Hinc *Spiritus* dicitur *nostris infirmitatibus succurrere, ut oremus quod oportet sicut oportet*, Rom. 8, 26. et Apostolus Hebr. 13, 21. et alibi, orat Deum, *ut ipsos perficiat in omni bono opere, efficiens in illis quod coram ipso complacitum est per Jesum Christum*.

XXVI Modus* hujus actionis Divinae in nobis non est curiose inquirendus, interim tamen sedulo vitandi sunt Pelagianorum aut Semipelagianorum errores, item quorundam Sophistarum; qui vel gratiam hanc secundum merita dari statuebant, vel secundum bonos voluntatis* nostrae motus, vel per solas, ut loquuntur, morales suasiones, et non reales operationes, vel denique ita ut efficacia Divinae operationis pendeat ex hominis naturali* arbitrio.* Quos omnes ac similes errores in Pelagianis et Semipelagianis olim condemnatos, et nos condemnamus, quia in gratiam* Divinam sunt injurii, et homini se ipsum discernenti aliquam gloriandi materiam relinquunt. Nos vero cum Augustino[a] statuimus, *gratiam non esse gratiam ullo modo, si non sit gratuita omni modo*, et gratiam in nobis operantem et cooperantem habere suam in nobis certam efficaciam, ex Dei miserentis proposito, non ex nostrae voluntatis arbitrio.*

XXVII Explicata, quantum hic sufficere judicamus, regenerationis doctrina, reliquum est ut de poenitentia, seu potius resipiscentia activa, et specialiter sic dicta, nonnulla subjiciamus.

XXVIII Poenitentiae vocem* a poena derivari manifestum est, nam ut Agellius[b] recte notat, *quae taedio ac pudori sunt, ea puniendi vim habent*. Quoniam ergo is qui poenitentia vera alicujus facti ducitur, ejusdem fere poenam a se ipso, intra semetipsum exigit, ideo hic animi affectus* poenitentiae nomen* accepit. Unde et ipse Apostolus 2 Cor. 7, 11. inter veras resipiscentiae proprietates *indignationem ac vindictam enumerat*, quam scilicet peccator a se sumit per internum dolorem illum, qui perperam facta comitari solet.

---

[a] Probably Augustine, *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali* 31.34 (CSEL 42:152). [b] In his *Loci* Walaeus also ascribes this quotation to Agellius (*Opera* 1:441a). In both cases it seems to be a typographical error. It was not possible to trace the quote literally in Gellius's work, but the reference may be from a secondary source to Gellius *Noctes Atticae* XVII.1.7 (LCL 212:198). Johann Gerhard (1582–1637) gives exactly the same quotation with this reference in his *Loci theologici* XV.1.3. (*Loci* 3:204).

even more fruit" (John 15:2). And hence it says also that "the Spirit helps our infirmities, so that we know what we should pray for as we ought" (Romans 8:26). And the apostle prays in Hebrews 13:21 and elsewhere that "God equip them with every good thing, working in them what is pleasing in his sight through Jesus Christ."

We should not make curious enquiries about the way* in which God per- 26
forms this action in us; but at the same time we should be careful to avoid the errors of the Pelagians, semi-Pelagians, and certain Sophists.[28] They stated that this grace is given on the grounds of our merits, or the good movements of our will,* or, in their words, through moral counsels alone and not real works—in short, that the efficacy of the working of God depends on the natural* choice* of man. All these and similar errors of the Pelagians and semi-Pelagians were condemned long ago, and we, too, condemn them, because they do injustice to the grace* of God, and for the man who distinguishes himself they leave some opportunity for boasting. But we, following Augustine, state that "grace would not be grace at all if it were not entirely freely given." And the certain effect of grace that is operating and co-operating in us comes not by the choice* of our will but by what the merciful God has purposed.[29]

Now that we have, in our view, explained the doctrine of regeneration suffi- 27
ciently, it remains for us to append a few things about penitence, or rather and especially the so-called active repentance.

It is obvious that the word* 'penitence' derives from 'penalty,' for as A[ulus] 28
Gellius rightly observes, "whatever is cause for trouble and shame has the force of punishment."[30] Therefore whoever is really driven by penitence over some deed or other within his own heart exacts from himself what amounts to punishment, to the point that the affection* of his heart bears the name* 'penitence.' For this reason also the apostle himself, in 2 Corinthians 7:11, lists among the true properties of repentance "indignation and vengeance" which the sinner demands of himself for that inner feeling of regret which usually comes on the heels of wrongdoings.

---

28 Cf. Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.15 "The Boasted Merit of Works," with specific identification of the 'Sophists' as the Sorbonnian theologians who distort some ambiguous passages in the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard in order to promote the meritorious character of our works in virtue of free choice (3.15.7). See also *Institutes* 3.18 for a more detailed refutation of these and similar 'sophisms.'

29 Romans 9:16.

30 The reference seems to be to the *Attic Nights* (*Noctes Atticae*) of Aulus Gellius (c. 125–c. 180), a Latin author and grammarian, brought up in Rome. The book consists of a compilation of notes on grammar, philosophy, history, and other subjects.

XXIX Et hoc respectu, poenitentiae nomen,* licet integram verae resipiscentiae formam non comprehendat, per Synecdochen* tamen in Ecclesia Christi retineri posse concedimus, modo* dolorem illum pro peccatis satisfactorium, ut a Pontificiis fit, non statuamus.

XXX Vox* μεταμελείας, quae curam atque anxietatem animi post factum aliquod poenitendum proprie* denotat, voci poenitentiae non male respondet, et de taedio ac dolore, quem vitae emendatio non sequitur, frequenter usurpatur; licet ea ad veram resipiscentiam significandam* nonnunquam adhibeatur, ut Matt. 21, 29. et alibi.

XXXI Vox* Hebraea, תשובה, reversio aut conversio, quemadmodum et Graeca vox μετάνοια, i. mentis post factum in melius mutatio, seu resipiscentia, ut Lactantius vertit Lib. 6. cap. 24.[a] ad vim rei, de qua agimus, significandam,* sunt accommodatiores. Nam quem vere poenitet, is a malo ad bonum convertitur; et mentem in melius mutat, licet et vox μετανοίας de legali tantum conversione dicta reperiatur, ut Sapient. cap. 5. vers. 3.

XXXII Ex iis, quae de vocibus* jam dicta sunt, quid vera poenitentia, seu potius resipiscentia sit, commode colligi potest. Cum enim in omni mutatione sit terminus* a quo, et terminus* ad quem, in hac quoque salutari mentis mutatione uterque hic est attendendus.

XXXIII Terminus* a quo est malum, vel peccati ac Satanae regnum; terminus* ad quem est bonum contrarium, seu Christi ac justitiae regnum. Respectu prioris termini,* *conversio a peccatis atque a viis malis appellatur*, 1 Reg. 8, 35. Esa. 59, 20. Respectu vero posterioris termini,* *conversio ad Deum* Israelis, Jer. 16, 19. Conjungitur vero uterque terminus* Act. 26, 18. *ut convertantur a tenebris ad lucem, et de potestate Satanae ad Deum*. Quae duae resipiscentiae partes in Novo Testamento per mortificationem veteris hominis, et vivificationem novi nonnunquam intelliguntur.

[a] Lactantius, *Institutiones divinae* 6.24 (CSEL 19/1:572).

29 And in this regard we may allow the word* 'penitence' (even though it does not entail the entire form of true repentance) to be kept in usage in Christ's Church as an expression of the part for the whole,* provided that we do not think that grief of this sort* is able to make satisfaction for sins, as happens among the papal teachers.[31]

30 The word* *metameleia*, which properly* means the anxious worry of the heart after some punishable deed, corresponds fairly well to the word 'penitence' and is used frequently for the kind of trouble and grief that are not followed by a change in lifestyle; yet it is employed sometimes in order to mean* true repentance, as in Matthew 21:29 and elsewhere.[32]

31 The Hebrew word* *t^{e}shuva*, 'return,' or conversion, and also the Greek word *metanoia*, that is, the change of heart for the better after a deed, or 'repentance' as Lactantius[33] translates the Hebrew word (in book 6, chapter 24), are better suited to denote* the sense of what we are treating. For someone who is genuinely penitent turns himself from evil towards the good, and he changes his mind for the better, although one finds the word *metanoia* used for a merely legal conversion, for instance Wisdom 5:3.[34]

32 From what we have said already about the terms* one can gather easily what true penitence, or rather repentance, is. For since every change has both a point* from which it starts and a point* where it ends, so for the life-saving transformation of one's heart we should pay attention to both points.

33 The point* from which conversion starts is the evil, or the reign of sin and Satan; the point* where it ends is its opposite: the good, or the reign of Christ and righteousness. Regarding the former point,* conversion is called "a turning away from sins and evil ways" (1Kings 8:35, Isaiah 59:20). Regarding the latter point,* it is called the "turning toward the God of Israel" (Jeremiah 16:19). The two points* occur together in Acts 26:18, as people "turn from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God." These two aspects of repentance are what is sometimes understood in the New Testament by 'the putting to death of the old man' and 'the coming to life of the new.'

---

31 See also thesis 44 below. Bellarmine mentions 'penitence' as one of the dispositions necessary for justification; see Bellarmine, *De Justificatione* 1.13 (*Opera* 6:177a).

32 The Greek of Matthew 21:29 has *metamelèstheis* and the Latin *poenitentia*. *Metamelomai* means to experience remorse. The crucial point is here that the penitent does not only do penitence, but also experiences remorse and repentance; cf. thesis 35 below. This component is not essential to the meaning of *poenitentia*.

33 For Lactantius (c. 250–c. 320) see *SPT* 1.2, note 2.

34 "They will speak to one another in repentance [*metanoountes*], and in anguish of spirit they will groan, and say …" (NRSV).

XXXIV Etsi vero duabus hisce partibus, seu terminis,* tota conversionis natura* exprimatur, tamen utrique parti proprietates quaedam adjunctae sunt, sine quibus resipiscentia non est.

XXXV Aversioni a malo conjunctus est dolor animi, qui contritio et attritio a nonnullis appellatur; conversioni ad bonum, spes veniae et gaudium animi, quod via prava relicta ad rectam transitio sit facta. *Verus enim poenitens de peccatis dolet, et de dolore gaudet*.[a]

XXXVI Dolor ille ab Apostolo Paulo 2 Cor. 7, 10. duplex statuitur, *dolor mundi qui mortem operatur, et dolor secundum Deum, qui resipiscentiam ad salutem efficit*.

XXXVII *Dolor mundi* est, quando peccator de peccato admisso quidem dolet, sed ob causas propter quas et homines mundani dolere hic solent. Qualis est ignominiae aut poenarum, aut conscientiae legale judicium, ex comminationibus legalibus, et earum seria apprehensione profectum, Rom. 2, 5. et 4, 15. Ex hoc dolore, si ulterius non procedat, vel absorbetur, et in desperationem ruit peccator, sicut in Juda proditore Christi videmus; vel, si dolorem illum evincere potest, peccator ad ingenium redit, ut exemplo Achabi manifestum est.

XXXVIII *Dolor* vero *secundum Deum*, non tantum effectu a dolore mundi distinguitur, ut Apostolus antecedente loco notat, sed etiam natura,* quia non solum ex caritate propria et metu poenae nascitur, sed cum odio et displicentia ipsius peccati conjunctus est, Rom. 7, 15. etc. et cum pudore offensi Dei, quem jam

[a] This is not a literal quotation, but a common summary of Augustine's thought expressed in *De vera et falsa poenitentia*. Cf. Johann Gerhard, *Loci theologici* (Berlin: Schlawitz, 1863–1870), 3:204.

And although the whole nature* of conversion is expressed in these two 34
aspects or points,* certain properties are associated with each of them, and without these it is no repentance.

Connected to this turning away from evil is a grief within the soul that is 35
called by some 'contrition' or 'attrition.'[35] And connected to turning towards the good is a hope for forgiveness and a delight of the soul, because when the wrong way is left behind a shift has been made towards the right way. For "the truly penitent man grieves over his sins, and he is pleased with his grieving."

In 2 Corinthians 7:10 the apostle Paul states that this grief is twofold: it is "a 36
worldly grief that brings death and a godly grief that leads to repentance unto salvation."[36]

Worldly grief comes about when the sinner does indeed grieve over a sin he 37
has committed, but then he does so for the same reasons as the people of this world are accustomed to doing. Such grief arises from a verdict of disgrace in the eyes of the Law, either in punishment or in the conscience, a verdict that proceeds from the threats of the Law and from taking them seriously (Romans 2:5, 4:15). If the sinner does not proceed to go beyond this grief, or if he is obsessed by it, then he also falls headlong into despair, as we see in the case of Judas who betrayed Christ. Or, if the sinner does succeed in overcoming his grief, then he reverts to his characteristic ways, as is evidenced in the case of Ahab.

But godly grief is distinguished from worldly grief not just in its effect (as 38
the apostle points out in the previously mentioned place) but also in its own nature,* because it not only arises from self-love and fear of punishment, but also is accompanied by a hatred and displeasure of sin itself (Romans 7:15, etc.) and a shame for having offended God, whom he now, in faith, begins to regard

35 In medieval scholastic Latin these terms have different meanings. *Contritio* is *contritio cordis*—an experience in which the soul is 'crushed' and the heart 'shattered.' In the case of attrition a person is also sorry about what he or she has done, but without that damaging and shattering experience and feeling. The Council of Trent defines contrition as "sorrow of heart and detestation for sin committed, with the resolution not to sin again" (DH 1676). Perfect contrition is motivated purely by the love for God. A less perfect attitude, motivated by other moral impulses, is labeled 'attrition.' The strict theological approach holds that there cannot be forgiveness of factual guilt without the contrition of the heart. However, in Roman Catholic theology, difference of opinion is possible as to the question whether full contrition is a prerequisite condition for the sacramental absolution, or whether the initial and imperfect attrition is completed toward loving contrition by the grace of the sacrament of penance itself. See Karl Rahner, "Contrition," in *Encyclopaedia of Theology: A Concise Sacramentum Mundi* (London: Burns & Oates, 1975), 288–291.

36 The original order of the two clauses in 2 Corinthians 7:10 is inverted here.

ut benignum patrem per fidem intueri incipimus, ut ex Rom. 6, 21. et exemplo Davidis, Petri, ac parabola filii prodigi patet.

XXXIX Conversioni ad Deum conjuncta est approbatio divinae Legis, Rom. 6, 16.[a] et oblectatio in studio ejus, Ps. 1. et 119. spes veniae ex promissionibus Evangelicis per fidem apprehensis concepta, Ps. 130, 4. et consolatio denique ac gaudium spirituale, *quia caritas Dei diffunditur in cordibus nostris per Spiritum Sanctum qui datus est nobis*, Rom. 5, 2. et 5. item 13, 17.

XL Ex iis quae hactenus dicta sunt, patet solutio ad quaestionem satis difficilem, in cujus explicatione quidam Ecclesiae reformatae magni auctores videntur dissentire: An fides resipiscentiae pars sit? Nam si resipiscentiae vox* lata significatione sumatur, pro toto conversionis nostrae opere, sicut aliquando in Scriptura usurpatur, Act. 3, 19. et 11, 18. certe et fides nostra in illo est, sicut infidelitas ei contraria sub corde ἀμετανοήτῳ comprehenditur ab Apostolo, Rom. 2, 5.

XLI Sin vero resipiscentiae vox* stricte sumatur, sicut antea a nobis est definita, tum a fide distingui solet, tamquam causa* et ejus proprius effectus ac fructus, atque ita eam ipsa Scriptura distinguit diversis in locis, vide Marc. 1, 15. Act. 20, 21. etc.

XLII Nam ut peccatum vere oderimus, de Deo offenso, tamquam patre benigno, serio doleamus, justitiam diligamus, et spem veniae, atque animi spirituale gaudium ex eo concipiamus, necessarium omnino est, ut Christum antea per fidem nobis applicemus, atque in eo Deum tamquam benignum patrem intueamur; etsi et hoc libenter fateamur, quod salutaris ille fidei sensus, per resipiscentiae verae consensum, magis ac magis in nobis se exserat ac confirmetur.

XLIII Ex his, quae hactenus a nobis exposita sunt, videmus quid sentiendum sit de doctrina illa Pontificiorum, qui poenitentiae suae (quam et perperam

[a] 7:16: *Opera* 1:441.

as a kindly father, as is clear from Romans 6:21, and from the examples of David, Peter, and the parable of the prodigal son.

Linked to the turning to God is an approval of God's Law (Romans 7:16) and 39
a delight in observing it (Psalm 1[:1] and 119[:18]), a hope for forgiveness drawn from the Gospel promises that have been received in faith (Psalm 130:4), and even a sense of comfort and spiritual joy because "God's love is poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit whom He gave to us" (Romans 5:2, 5; similarly verse 13 and 17).

From what we have said thus far there is an obvious answer to the fairly 40
difficult question whether faith is part of repentance, a question over which some of the foremost authors of the Reformed Church seem to disagree.[37] For if we take the word* repentance in the wider sense of the whole work of our conversion, as it is used in some places in Scripture (Acts 3:19 and 11:18), then indeed faith also is included in it, in the same way as the apostle understands faithlessness—the opposite of faith—to reside in the heart that is unrepentant (*ametanoētos*, Romans 2:5).

But if we take the word* repentance in the stricter sense as we defined it 41
earlier,[38] then it is usually kept distinct from faith, as a cause* and the proper effect and result of that cause; it is in this way that Scripture itself in various places distinguishes repentance (Mark 1:15, Acts 20:21, etc.).

In order for us to have a true hatred of our sins, genuinely grieve for the 42
offenses we have committed against God as against our kindly father, to cherish righteousness, and in our souls to begin fostering the hope for forgiveness and spiritual joy from him, it is altogether necessary that in faith we first apply Christ to ourselves, and in him to regard God as a kindly father. But we also grant freely that the inner sense of saving faith is strengthened and displayed more and more in us through the corresponding sense of true repentance.

From the explanations given thus far we see what we ought to think about 43
that doctrine of the papal teachers[39] who create three parts for penitence (and

37 Walaeus is probably referring to the tendency among Reformed authors to emphasize regeneration as the infusion of a spiritual disposition (*habitus*) by the Holy Spirit as the prerequisite for faith in the act of believing. Without rejecting this, Walaeus rather emphasizes repentance as the result of faith and of the effectual calling.

38 See thesis 2 above, where repentance in the stricter sense is defined as the act of penitence that proceeds from the disposition of regeneration and not as regeneration itself. Faith is then the cause and repentance its proper effect and result. See Calvin (*Institutes*, 3.3.5) for a rather strict distinction of faith and repentance, in which repentance is understood as a part or effect of faith.

39 In the next theses (43–47), Walaeus deals with the sacrament of penitence in the Roman Catholic Church. Besides denying the qualification as a 'sacrament' (cf. disputation 43

sacramentum* constituunt) tres partes faciunt, nempe contritionem cordis, confessionem oris, satisfactionem operis.

XLIV Nam quod contritionem attinet, nos eam in poenitentia vera necessariam statuimus, eo sensu quo id a nobis supra est explicatum, modo* et dolorem illum ob peccata secundum Deum intelligamus, et pro peccatis satisfactorium non agnoscamus. Gratiae enim Dei, non contritioni attribuenda est peccatorum remissio, ut *Glossa de Poenitent. distinct.* 2. c. 1.[a] *contra Concilii Trident. definitionem sess.* 14. c. 4.[b] recte exposuit.

XLV Confessionem quoque duplicem approbamus, tamquam verae poenitentiae adjunctum; qua vel apud Deum privatim, Ps. 32. sive publice cum tota Ecclesia, Neh. 9. aut coram Ecclesia in publicis scandalis, 2 Cor. 2. peccator sua peccata agnoscit; vel apud homines et fratres offensos ad eorum reconciliationem id facit, Luc 17, 9.

XLVI Etsi vero non diffiteamur, quin consultum sit in gravibus animi angoribus, ut peccator ad consolationem capiendam, delicta sua apud alios pios viros imprimis verbi ministros, nonnunquam confiteatur, quo locus Jac. 5, 16. quoque referri potest: tamen inde non sequitur, auricularem illam confessionem Papisticam in Ecclesia esse admittendam; cum ea sit crudelissima animarum carnificina, praeter Dei verbum excogitata, et simul impossibilis homini Christiano. *Delicta enim sua quis intelligit?* Ps. 19, 12.

XLVII Satisfactionem denique pro peccatis coram Deo, nullam nisi Jesu Christi servatoris nostri pretiosum sanguinem agnoscimus, *qui solus nos purgat ab omnibus peccatis nostris*, 1 Joh. 1, 7. *et unica oblatione in perpetuum consummavit eos, qui sanctificantur*, Hebr. 10, 14. Et nullum instrumentum, quo nobis Christi satisfactionem applicamus, quam fidem in ipsum, *quia Deus illum nobis proposuit*

[a] The reference is to the Glosses on the *Decretum Gratiani*; see *Decretum Gratiani emendatum et notationibus illustratum una cum glossis* (Lyons: Antoine Pillehotte, 1624), part 2, cause 33, question 3 "De Poenitentia," distinction 1 chapter 1 (relevant quotation on col. 1663 *in margine*).
[b] DH 1676.

"On the Sacraments in General," particularly corollary 4), Walaeus criticizes the standard elements that were required for the penitence: *contritio cordis*, *confessio oris* and *satisfatio operis*. These requirements were formulated already around 600 by Gregory the Great as *conversio mentis, confessio oris, vindicata peccati*, and were epitomized by Thomas Aquinas in his *Summa theologiae*, 3.90,2; see the article "Penance," in *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, ed. Everett Ferguson and others, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 1999), 891–893. We should realize that parts of Renaissance Catholic theology changed the spiritual substance of these notions by introducing the idea of merits and the meritorious function of what human persons do. On the debates between the participants of the Council of Trent see Hubert Jedin, *Geschichte des Konzils von Trient*, Band II: *Die erste Trienter Tagungsperiode 1545/47* (Freiburg: Herder, 1957), 139–164.

who also wrongly make it into a sacrament*), namely: the contrition of the heart, the confession of the mouth, and the satisfaction in works.

As far as contrition is concerned, we deem that it is an element necessary 44
for true penitence in the sense* we explained above,[40] provided that we understand the grief for our sins to be a godly grief and also not count it as sufficient satisfaction for our sins. For we must ascribe the forgiveness of sins to the grace of God and not to our own contrition, as it is rightly explained in the note *On Penitence*, distinction 2, chapter 1 (contrary to the definition of the Council of Trent, session 14, chapter 4).[41]

And we also approve two kinds of confession as something that belongs 45
to true penitence. Hereby the sinner acknowledges his own sins before God, privately (Psalm 32) or publicly as part of the entire church (Nehemiah 9), or in the presence of the church in the case of public scandals (2 Corinthians 2). Or the confession is made before individual people, the brothers who have been offended, in order to reconcile with them (Luke 17:9).

We do not deny that when there is serious mental anguish it is prudent for 46
the sinner, in order to obtain consolation, sometimes to confess his own sins before other, upright men, especially ministers of the Word (for which one could refer also to James 5:16). And yet it does not follow from this that the papist[42] practice of auricular confession should be introduced into the Church, since that is a most cruel torture of the soul, something contrived apart from God's Word, and also impossible for the Christian. "For who discerns his own sins?" (Psalm 19:12).

And lastly, for the satisfaction of sins in the presence of God we recognize 47
nothing other than the precious blood of Jesus Christ our Savior, "which alone cleanses us from all our sins" (1John 1:7); and "by his one offering he has for ever made perfect those who are sanctified" (Hebrews 10:14). And there is no instrument whereby we make the satisfaction by Christ our own except by faith in him, "because God has presented him as the atoning sacrifice for us, through

40 See theses 35 and 38 above.

41 The note *On Penitence* states that contrition is a sign that sins are forgiven, whereas the Council of Trent claims that contrition prepares the remission of sins.

42 The Latin *papisticus* has a pejorative connotation as distinct from the more neutral *pontificius*: pontifical, papal; see, for example, thesis 43 above.

ἱλαστήριον, placamentum per fidem in sanguine ejus, Rom. 3, 25. cujus fidei fructus et individuus comes, est vera et a nobis hactenus descripta resipiscentia.

XLVIII Dividitur autem haec vera et Evangelica resipiscentia in universalem, quando scilicet homo primum a statu peccati in statum justitiae transit, et ad Deum initio convertitur; et particularem, quando homo jam conversus et fidelis, a peccato praeventus, de eodem dolet et ab eodem resipiscit.

XLIX Haec particularis rursum est duplex, vel ordinaria, vel extraordinaria. Ordinaria est, quam toto vitae cursu vere fideles et sancti, ex infirmitatis et quotidianorum lapsuum conscientia, agere tenentur, Rom. 7, 24. Extraordinaria, quando fideles in peccatum aliquod grave, et conscientiam alte vulnerans incidunt, qualem in Davide et Petro post lapsus ipsorum videmus.

L Quae rursum est vel unius alicujus fidelis, vel totius coetus et Ecclesiae, sicuti multa hujus poenitentiae exempla ad Dei iram mitigandam, aut praeveniendam proposita, in Scripturis occurrunt. Et haec extraordinaria poenitentia, sive publica, sive privata, cum extraordinariis doloris atque humiliationis signis semper conjuncta fuit, qualia sunt jejunia, fletus, cilicia, vestium scissura, etc.

LI Errant ergo graviter Novatiani qui lapsus post baptismum poenitentiam inutilem statuerunt, aut relapsos ad Ecclesiae communionem admittendos negarunt. Nam (ut cum Tertulliano[a] loquamur) *non statim succidendus aut subruendus est animus desperatione, si secundae quis poenitentiae debitor fuerit: pigeat*

[a] Tertullian, *De poenitentiae* 7 (CSEL 76:160).

faith in his blood" (Romans 3:25). The fruit and inseparable companion of that faith is the true repentance that we have thus far described.

True Gospel-based repentance consists of two types. Universal repentance 48
occurs whenever someone crosses over from a state of sin to a state of righteousness and is converted to God for the first time. And particular repentance occurs when someone who has already been converted and believes is overtaken by sin and then grieves over it and repents from it.

And this particular repentance, in turn, is twofold, either ordinary or extraor- 49
dinary. Ordinary repentance is the one which true believers and saints throughout the course of their entire lives are bound to exercise out of awareness of their weaknesses and daily shortcomings (Romans 7:24). Extraordinary repentance occurs when the faithful fall into some serious sin that hurts their conscience deeply, such as we see in the case of David or Peter after they fell.

Then again, this [extraordinary] repentance may be that of a single believer 50
or of the entire congregation and church; and in Scripture one comes across many examples of this type of penitence intended to assuage God's anger or to forestall what he intends to do. And, whether public or private, this penitence is always accompanied by extraordinary signs of grief and humility, such as fasting, weeping, wearing a *cilicium*, tearing one's clothes, etc.[43]

For this reason the Novatians[44] make a serious mistake when they think 51
that it is useless to do penitence for back-sliding after one has been baptized, and when they state that those who have fallen back into sin should not be admitted into the communion of the Church. For, to use the words of Tertullian, "if someone needs to repent a second time, his soul should not immediately be plunged into or be overwhelmed by despair. Let him be ashamed for having put

43 In the early church the *cilicium* ('hair shirt') was an undergarment made of goat's-hair worn next to the skin as a means of self-castigation. The term may derive from the Greek word *kilikion*, which refers to the region of Cilicia (currently south-central Turkey) where garments of goat's hair were said to be made. Cf. the Old Testament practice of wearing sackcloth, and the camel's-hair garment worn by John the Baptist.

44 In the middle of the third century, the Latin Church wrestled with the question how to deal with *lapsi* during the persecutions under the Emperors Decius (250) and Valerian (257–258). Novatian, a presbyter in Rome, joined the views of Cyprian († 258) who refused to extend peace to the lapsed. When in 251 Cornelius (251–253) became bishop of Rome, Novatian started to oppose him. Regarding the issue of the *lapsi* Cornelius's view was very mild. In this conflict Novatian was consecrated as counter-bishop over against Cornelius. Probably Novatian died as a martyr under emperor Valerian (253–260). He also wrote *De Trinitate*, criticizing the Monarchians and defending the divinity of Christ as being one with the Father. See the article "Novatian" in Ferguson and others, *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, 819–820.

iterum periclitari, sed non item liberari: neminem pudeat, iteratae valetudinis iteranda medicina est.

LII Errant et hic non minus Anabaptistae quidam, qui peccatores, licet resipiscentes, ab Ecclesiae communione movendos et Satanae tradendos sentiunt, ut extra, non intra Ecclesiam poenitentiam agant. Nam etsi fateamur in gravia peccata lapsos a signis gratiae* ad tempus posse suspendi, ut interea scandalum ab Ecclesia tollatur, et veritas resipiscentiae ex fructibus exploretur, tamen pugnat cum perspicuis Christi verbis, Matt. 18, 17. et totius Ecclesiae Apostolicae praxi, ut peccator poenitentiam coram Ecclesia professus, ab eadem Ecclesia pro Ethnico et Publicano habeatur.

LIII Resipiscentiae finis* seu terminus,* est vita haec nostra, proinde ulterius differenda non est, sed praevertenda dum hodie vocatur, Hebr. 3, 13. *Nam hic tantum*, ut Augustinus[a] loquitur, *fructuosa est resipiscentia, agenda in futurum non proficit*, quemadmodum Christus parabola fatuarum et sapientum virginum docuit, Matt. 25, 11. et deinceps.

[a] This seems to be a loose reference to Augustine, *Confessiones* 13.34.49 (CSEL 33:386). Cf. Augustine, *Sermo* 82.14 on Matt. 18:15 (MPL 38:512–513).

himself at risk a second time, but not for being delivered again. No-one should be ashamed when it is necessary to repeat a cure for a recurring illness."

On this point some of the Anabaptists[45] are equally mistaken when they 52
think that sinners should be removed from the communion of the Church and handed over to Satan[46] so that they can do penance outside rather than within the Church—even though the sinners have repented. For while we admit that those who have fallen into serious sins can be withheld from the signs of grace* for a period of time so that meanwhile the scandal can be removed from the Church and the genuineness of the repentance may be tested by its fruits, yet it is contrary to the clearly-spoken words of Christ (in Matthew 18:17) and the practice of the whole apostolic church that the very same church before which a sinner has publicly declared his repentance should treat him as a heathen and a tax-collector.

It is this life that we currently lead which forms the goal,* or end,* of repen- 53
tance, and for that reason we should not put off repentance any longer but we should attend to it today, while it is yet called 'today' (Hebrews 3:13). For, as Augustine puts it, it is only here and now that repentance bears fruit; repentance that is to be done in the future is of no benefit, as Christ taught in the parable of the wise and foolish maidens (Matthew 25:11 ff.).[47]

45 On the rigorous application of the ban (or excommunication) among Anabaptist congregations in the Netherlands see Williams, *Radical Reformation*, 731–753. The frequent and mutual banning by Anabaptist leaders such as Menno Simons, Dirk Philips, and Leonard Bouwens, caused the movement to split in three parties labeled (in rank of strictness) Flemings, Frisians, and Waterlanders. On the Waterlanders and their Confession of Faith of 1577 see Williams, *Radical Reformation*, 1188–1190. The practice of excommunication among the specifically Dutch Anabaptists helps to understand the background of Walaeus's position in this regard.

46 1 Corinthians 5:5.

47 The idea of repentance after this life is further discussed in disputation 39 "On Purgatory and Indulgences."

DISPUTATIO XXXIII

De Justificatione Hominis coram Deo

Praeside D. ANTONIO THYSIO
Respondente JACOBO DISSIO

THESIS I Post tractationem de Vocatione, eique respondente obedientia, et Fidei, et inde Resipiscentiae; consequens est, ut agamus de hominis per fidem Justificatione et Sanctificatione, seu sanctis operibus. Ac primum quidem de *Justificatione peccatoris coram Deo*, qui locus in Theologia facile primarius, nobisque maxime salutaris est; quo obscurato, adulterato vel everso, fieri nequit ut puritas doctrinae in aliis locis retineatur, aut vera Ecclesia consistat; cujus haec summa atque basis est, quod misericors et justus Deus, Filii sui justitia credentibus condonet peccata, et salvos faciat.

II Vox* *justificandi*, δικαιοῦν καὶ δικαιοῦσθαι, et inde *justificationis*, δικαιώματος καὶ δικαιώσεως, qualiter redditur Hebr. הצדיק ex proprietate et usu linguae Hebraeae, proprie* et fere semper forinseca et forensis actio est, judicis et judicii, scilicet in rei absolutione, condemnationi opposita, Deut. 25, 1. Prov. 17, 15. quamvis et antecedentes, cohaerentes et consequentes actus,* etiam privatim institutos, quibus quis declaratur, evincitur, approbatur et censetur justus, denotet.

III Ac speciatim illo sensu accipitur, dum agitur de judicio Dei absolventis hominem peccatorem coram suo tribunali, Ps. 143, 2. Rom. 5, 16. et 8, 33. 34. Unde etiam totus hic actus* Justificationis forensi processu describitur. Neque tamen diffitemur, propter summam et arctissimam connexionem, justificatio-

DISPUTATION 33

On the Justification of Man in the Sight of God

President: Antonius Thysius
Respondent: Jacobus Dissius[1]

Now that we have treated the calling [of man] and the obedience—both of faith and of repentance—that answers to it, it follows that we deal with man's justification and sanctification (or sacred works) by faith. And we shall deal first with the justification of the sinner in the sight of God, as this is easily the foremost *locus* in theology, and for us the one most salutary. And if this *locus* is suppressed, falsified, or overturned, it would not be possible to keep the purity of the teaching in other *loci* or to maintain a true Church.[2] Now the main point and basis of this *locus* is the fact that a merciful and just God pardons the sins of believers through the righteousness of his Son and causes them to be saved. 1

The word* 'to justify' (*dikaioun* and *dikaiousthai*), and thence 'justification' (*dikaiōma* and *dikaiōsis*), which renders the Hebrew word *ḥitzdiq*[3] according to its proper* usage in the Hebrew language, is strictly speaking nearly always a forensic term denoting a forensic act of judgment by a judge, that is, of setting a guilty party free instead of condemning him (Deuteronomy 25:1; Proverbs 17:15). But it may also denote the actions* that precede, accompany, or follow it (even actions undertaken privately), whereby someone is declared, confirmed, commended, or deemed to be righteous. 2

But the word is used with that specialized meaning when it concerns the judgment of God as He absolves the sinner who stands before his judgment seat (Psalm 143:2; Romans 5:16 and 8:33–34). And so this entire act of justification is depicted as a forensic process.[4] Yet we still grant that justification sometimes 3

1 Born in 1599 in Delft, Jacobus Arnoldi Ditsius (Van Lieburg: Distius) matriculated in philosophy on August 26, 1618. He defended this disputation in 1622. He was ordained in 't Woudt (in the province of Holland) in 1623; he died in 1662. See Du Rieu, *Album studiosorum*, 137 and Van Lieburg, *Repertorium*, 50.

2 This reflects what is also expressed by the adage that justification is the article by which the church either stands or falls which is first attested literally in 1615 in Balthasar Meisner, *Anthropologia sacra*; see also Theodor Mahlmann, "Articulus stantis et (vel) cadentis ecclesiae," *RGG*[4] 1:1998.

3 This Hebrew verb (*hitzdiq*) is the hiph'il form of *tzadaq*, which is regularly causative in meaning; 'to do justice' or 'to declare righteous,' 'to justify.'

4 For a discussion of the concept of forensic justification in early Protestantism see McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, 188–225.

nem quoque sanctificationem ipsam, ut consequens, videri nonnunquam complecti, Rom. 8, 30. Tit. 3, 7. etc.

IV Ei synonyma et paria sunt, *justum esse coram Deo*, Rom. 2, 13. *justum constituere*, Rom. 5. 19. *justitiam imputare*, Rom. 4, 3. *beatificare* et *beatificatio*, Rom. 4, 6.

V Justificatio porro, prout et *justitia personae*,* ut vulgo appellatur (qua persona universim, non cum respectu particularis causae,* quae justitia causae dici solet, justificatur; ac nihil aliud est quam conformitas totalis hominis et actionum ejus ad Legem Dei) duplex est: *Legalis et Evangelica*, illa ex Lege et ejus operibus, haec ex Fide, Act. 13, 38. 39. Rom. 3, 20. 21. 28. Gal. 3, 11. 12. Illa inhaerens, haec ex imputatione justitiae alienae, Rom. 4, 4. 5. 6, et 10, 3. 5. 6. Illa post lapsum nemo justificatur, hac vero omnis vera in Christum fide praeditus, Rom. 3, 20. 26. 30.

VI Haec vero, et *reconciliationis* et *benedictionis*, et *salutis* nomine* venit, Rom. 5, 10. 11. Gal. 3, 8. 14. Tit. 3, 4. 5. Quamvis reconciliatio potius quiddam consequens et justificationis effectus sit, et salus latius saepe pateat.

VII Est vero in foro divino hominis peccatoris Justificatio, *Dei judicium, quo impium et peccatorem in sese et obnoxium irae suae, ex mera sua gratia et misericordia, propter perfectam Christi obedientiam et justitiam, pro nobis praestitam, ac fide acceptam, justum pronunciat, id est, absolvit a peccato et maledicto, et Filii sui justitiam imputat, atque ita ei vitam aeternam adjudicat, ad hominis fidelis salutem, ac Dei misericordis et justi gloriam*. Quam definitionem universam fere complectitur Apostolus, Rom. 3, 24. 25. 26.

VIII Ejus *partes* duae sunt, Imputatio justitiae passivae seu *absolutio* a peccatis, et justitiae activae *imputatio*. Quarum illa a reatu et condemnatione liberamur, morteque aeterna eximimur; hac etiam praemio digni censemur, ac jus vitae aeternae accipimus, eaque nobis adjudicatur, Rom, 5, 17. 18. et 8. 3. 4. At propter arctissimam συγγένειαν una alteram complectitur συνεκδοχικῶς, Rom. 4, 22.

appears also to include sanctification as its consequence because of the very strong, close connection between the two (Romans 8:30; Titus 3:7, etc.).

Synonyms and similar words are "to be righteous before God" (Romans 2:13), 4
"to make righteous" (Romans 5:19), "to impute righteousness" (Romans 4:3), "to bless" and "blessedness" (Romans 4:6).

And as for justification, insofar as it is "righteousness regarding the per- 5
son"* (whereby a person is justified generally—not with respect to a particular cause,* usually called "the righteousness regarding the cause"[5]—and which is nothing other than the conformity of the entire man and his actions to God's Law), it is twofold: legal justification and Gospel-justification; the former justification is out of the Law and its works, while the latter is out of faith (Acts 13:38–39; Romans 3:20–21, 28; Galatians 3:11–12). The former is inherent, the latter is by the imputation of alien righteousness (Romans 4:4–6, and 10:3–5, 6). After the fall no-one is justified by the former, but by the latter everyone is justified who has been granted true faith in Christ (Romans 3:20, 26, 30).

This latter one also goes by the name* of "reconciliation," "blessing," and "sal- 6
vation" (Romans 5:10–11; Galatians 3:8, 14; Titus 3:4,5), although reconciliation is more a consequence and effect of justification, while salvation often has a broader range of meaning.

In the law-court of God, then, the justification of man as sinner is the 7
judgment of God whereby He pronounces righteous the person who is unholy and of himself a sinner subject to God's wrath. He does so out of his own mere grace and mercy, for the sake of the perfect obedience and righteousness of Christ that was offered on our behalf and that is received by faith. That is, He pardons the sinner from sin and the curse, and imputes to him the righteousness of his Son and so awards to him life eternal, for the salvation of the believing person and the glory of the merciful and just God. Nearly every part of this definition is included by the apostle in Romans 3:24–26.

There are two parts to justification: the imputation of passive righteousness 8
(or the absolution of sins), and the imputation of active righteousness. By the former we are set free from guilt and condemnation, and delivered from eternal death; by the latter we are deemed worthy even of a reward, and we receive the right to life eternal, which is awarded to us (Romans 5:17–18, 8:3–4). And because of the very close relationship between them, the one entails the other, as a part entails the whole (Romans 4:22), although justification taken in its

5 The term *justitia causae* is used in the context of ethics to explain that someone who is not faultless can defend his innocence in a certain case. See Van Asselt and Van den Brink, *Scholastic Discourse*, 234–235.

Quamvis justificatio κατ᾽ ἐξοχὴν, in peccatorum remissione saepe constituatur, Ps. 32,1. Rom. 4, 7.

IX *Causa* justificationis efficiens*, id est, is qui nos justificat, *Deus est*, Rom. 3, 26. 30. et 8, 33. Gal. 3, 8. Ipse enim solus est, ut Deus ac Dominus, ita et Legislator, adeoque et Judex, in quem ut peccata admittuntur, ita ea potest* remittere, Esa. 43, 25. Luc. 5, 21. Jac. 4, 12. et quidem tota S. Trinitas nempe *Pater*, Rom. 8, 33, *Filius*, Esa. 53, 11. Matt. 9, 2. 6. unde et ipse Judex erit vivorum et mortuorum; et *Spiritus Sanctus*, 1 Cor. 6, 11. Joh. 16, 8. 11. *Ordine tamen et discrimine personarum* servato*, ita ut Pater in Filio per Spiritum justificet; at pro agendi principio,* et certa singularique oeconomia, Patri propria sit *justificationis actio*, quemadmodum Filio *ejus meritum*, Spiritui vero Sancto *meriti* illius *applicatio* attribuitur.

X *Administra*, est verbi* promissionis seu Evangelii praeconium. Quo sensu Evangelium ipsum, *potentia Dei ad salutem*, et *in quo justitia Dei revelatur*, Rom. 1, 17. et *Verbum reconciliationis*, 2 Cor. 5, 19. et ipsi Praecones *justificare*,

most specific sense is often considered to consist in the remission of sins (Psalm 32:1; Romans 4:7).[6]

The efficient cause* for justification, i.e., the one by whom we are justified, 9
is God (Romans 3:26, 30 and 8:33; Galatians 3:8).[7] For He is the only one, as God and Lord, and so also as the lawgiver and judge, against whom sins are committed and by whom they therefore can* be forgiven (Isaiah 43:25; Luke 5:21; James 4:12). It is even by the Trinity as a whole: the Father (Romans 8:33), the Son (Isaiah 53:11 and Matthew 9:2,6), who himself will be the judge of the living and the dead, and the Holy Spirit (1 Corinthians 6:11; John 16:8,11), while an order and distinction in persons* is retained, so that it is the Father who justifies in the Son through the Spirit. As for the principle* of acting and the certain, specific economy,* the act of justification belongs to the Father, just as the merit for it is attributed to the Son and the application of that merit is attributed to the Spirit.

The assisting cause[8] is the preaching of the word of promise or the Gospel. 10
In this sense the Gospel itself is "the power of God unto salvation" and in it "the righteousness of God is revealed" (Romans 1:17); and it is "the word of reconciliation" (2 Corinthians 5:19). And it says that the preachers themselves

6 Johannes Piscator (1546–1625) denied the imputation of the active obedience of Christ because justification was a *simplex actio Dei* ("a simple act of God"). On this see Frans Lukas Bos, *Johann Piscator: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der reformierten Theologie* (Kampen: Kok, 1932), 242–243; cf. Gerrit Cornelis Berkouwer, *The Work of Christ* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965), 321–322. Thysius teaches the imputation of both Christ's active obedience, his sinless life, and his passive obedience, his atoning death, but he carefully emphasizes the unity of both. An extensive treatment of the issue is given by Cornelis P. Venema, "Calvin's Doctrine of the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness: Another Example of 'Calvin Against The Calvinists'?," *Mid-America Journal of Theology* 20 (2009): 15–47.

7 This disputation defines the efficient cause as "God" (thesis 9), the attendant assisting cause as "the preaching of the Gospel" (thesis 10), the internal impelling cause as "the peculiar grace of God" (thesis 11), the impelling external cause or the meritorious cause as "Christ the Mediator" (thesis 13), the material cause as "the righteousness that God imputes to us" (thesis 18), the form of justification as its "application" (thesis), and the twofold goal of justification as "God's glory" and "our salvation" (thesis 32). It is interesting to compare the position of the Council of Trent, for example. The efficient and final causes are similar, but the instrumental cause mentioned there is the sacrament of baptism (DH 1529). In the first repetition of the *Synopsis* cycle, Thysius offers a slightly different division of the causes and calls the Word and the sacraments instruments of justification. Antonius Thysius, *Disputationum theologicarum repetitarum trigesima-tertia, de iustificatione hominis coram Deo*, resp. Isaacus Basirius (Leiden: Elzevir, 1627), thesis 11.

8 The *causa administra* differs little from an instrumental cause, be it that mostly it is an active entity that serves the efficient cause, for instance angels who serve God. The term

Dan. 12, 3. *ligare et solvere*, Matt. 18, 18. *salvare*, 1 Tim. 4, 16. Jac. 5, 20. dicuntur.

XI *Causa* impulsiva interna*, qua Deus Pater a se motus fuit ad nostri justificationem, est peculiaris Dei gratia,* misericordia, φιλανθρωπία, caritas seu dilectio Dei, *tum* qua Redemptorem dedit, Joh. 3, 16. Rom. 5, 8. 9. Tit. 2, 11. et 3, 4. et in mortem ad justitiam et justificationem nostram tradidit, Rom. 4, 25. *Tum* qua illam Filii sui obedientiam extra nos quidem, sed pro nobis praestitam, ratam et gratam habuit, Eph. 5, 2. quo utroque respectu nos reconciliasse sibi in Christo dicitur, 2 Cor. 5, 18. *Tum denique* qua eam secundum aeternum suum decretum destinavit, et per Spiritum suum fide applicat electis suis. Rom. 8, 30.

XII Unde justificari nos *gratis, sua gratia*, Rom. 3, 24. *ipse propter se delere iniquitates nostras*, Esa. 43, 25, *apud ipsum esse propitiationem*, Ps. 130, 4. ipsaque nostri Justificatio, Dei χάρις et χάρισμα, *gratia* et *gratificatio,* δῶρον, δωρεὰ, et δώρημα, *donum et donatio*, idque ἐν χάριτι, *per gratiam*, seu liberalitatem suam, Rom. 5, 15.16. dicitur. Quod respectu nostri, operum meritis diserte opponitur, 2 Tim. 1, 9. Rom. 4, 4. et 11.

XIII *Causa** autem *impulsiva externa*, quae et *meritoria*, est Christus Mediator et Redemptor, θεάνθρωπος, id est, Filius Dei in una persona* verus Deus et homo, Joh. 6, 51. Act. 20, 28. Gal. 4, 4. 1 Joh. 1, 7. et quidem quatenus Mediator et Redemptor, sive ejus obedientia, justitia, satisfactioque, Es. 53. quae Synecdochice,* sanguinis et mortis nomine* explicatur, in quo est λύτρον et ἀντίλυτρον, *pretium redemptionis,* λύτρωσις et ἀπολύτρωσις, *redemptio;* ἱλαστήριον et ἱλασμὸς, *propitiatorium et propitiatio*, Matt. 20, 28. Rom. 3, 24. 25. 1 Tim. 2, 6.

XIV Quare *ex parte Dei* nequaquam gratis fertur haec Dei sententia, sed pretiosissimo pretio persoluto, 1 Pet. 1. Quo fuit opus, tum quod ita Deus misericors, ut et justus, Rom. 3, 25. tum quod immutabilis et aeterna sit veritas comminationis illius, *Qua die ederis de arbore vetita, morte morieris*, Gen. 2, 17. et 3, 3. Quare et

---

is also used in *SPT* 14.29 for Eve who was the instrumental and supportive cause of Adam's transgression.

"justify" (Daniel 12:3), "bind and loosen" (Matthew 18:18), "save" (1 Timothy 4:16; James 5:20).

11 The internal impelling cause* whereby God the Father was moved by himself to justify us is the peculiar grace* of God, his mercy, philanthropy,[9] love, and affection, whereby He not only granted a Redeemer (John 3:16; Romans 5:8–9; Titus 2:11 and 3:4) and handed him over to death for our righteousness and justification (Romans 4:25), but also deemed valid and pleasing the obedience that his own Son presented apart from us but on our behalf (Ephesians 5:2). With respect to both of them together, 2 Corinthians 5:18 states that He has reconciled us to himself in Christ. And finally, hereby He destined it according to his eternal decree and applied it to his elect by faith through the Spirit (Romans 8:30).

12 And so Romans 3:24 states that we are justified "freely, by his grace," and Isaiah 43:25 that "he for his own sake blots out our iniquities." It says in Psalm 130:4 that "with him there is forgiveness," that our justification itself is "grace" (*charis*) of God, his "freely given favor," (*charisma*) a "gift and donation" (*dōron*, *dōrea*, and *dōrēma*), and it is given "by grace" (*en chariti*) or by his liberality (Romans 5:15–16). And as far as it concerns us, justification is clearly the opposite of what our works merit (2 Timothy 1:9; Romans 4:4 and 11).

13 The initiating external cause,* which is also the meritorious cause, is Christ the Mediator and Redeemer, the God-and-man; that is, the Son of God who in one person* is true God and true Man (John 6:51; Acts 20:28; Galatians 4:4; 1 John 1:7). And he is the cause insofar as he is the Mediator and Redeemer, or, it is his obedience, righteousness, and satisfaction (Isaiah 53). And this satisfaction is expressed synecdochically*[10] by the word* 'blood' or 'death' wherein the 'ransom' (*lutron*) lies and 'the ransom-price' (*antilutron*) or 'redemption' (*lutrōsis* and *apolutrōsis*), the 'atonement and propitiation' (*hilastērion* and *hilasmos*) (Matthew 20:28; Romans 3:24 and 25; 1 Timothy 2:6).

14 And as far as God's part is concerned, this verdict of God did not at all come for free, but only upon the payment of a most costly price (1 Peter 1[:19]). And this had to take place because while God is merciful He is also just (Romans 3:25), and also because that warning of his truly remains for ever and cannot be altered: "On the day that you eat of the forbidden tree, you shall surely

9 In disputations before the Synod of Dort the philanthropy of God was often connected to the general or external call. In *SPT* 30.27 Polyander refutes those who mix up God's love towards humanity (*philanthropia*) with his love for the elect. Here Thysius, however, uses the Greek term for God's love for the elect. See *SPT* 30.27, note 14 and Van den Belt, "*Vocatio* in the Leiden Disputations," 555.

10 See also *SPT* 24.46.

sine *effusione sanguinis esse non potuit peccatorum remissio*, Heb. 9, 22. Unde et *per* et *propter Christum* justificari dicimur, Rom. 3, 24. Quod ipsum operibus nostris eorumque similiter meritis directe opponitur.

XV *Materia* justificationis κατ᾽ ἄρσιν, negantur opera nostra esse. Non enim justificamur *lege, in lege, ex lege, per legem*, Gal. 3, 11. et 2, 21. *non lege Mosis*, Act. 13, 39. *non ex operibus*, Rom. 4, 2. et Eph. 2, 9. *non operibus legis*, Rom. 3, 20 et 9, 32. Gal. 2, 16. *non lege Justitiae*, Rom. 9, 31. *non nostra Justitia quae ex lege*, Phil. 3, 9. *non propria Justitia*, Rom. 10, 3. *non ex operibus, quae sunt in justitia quae fecerimus nos*, Tit. 3, 5.

XVI Qualiter *nemo justificatus* est, Rom. 3, 20. Gal. 2, 16. Non *Abraham* fidelium pater, Rom. 4, 2. Neque *David* vir secundum cor Dei, Rom. 4, 6. Nec *Paulus* electum illud vas, etiamsi nullius sibi conscius foret, 1 Cor. 4, 4. Phil. 3, 8. 9. aut ullus Sanctorum, Psal. 143, 2. Sed illi demum qui se ipsos justificant, at falso, Luc. 10, 29. et 16, 15. Ac ἀντιθέτως fit *sine operibus*, Rom. 4, 6. *sine operibus legis*, Rom. 3, 28. Quibus omnis legalis justitia qualiscunque, et quorumcunque, itemque gloriatio omnis, a Justificatione excluditur, Rom. 3, 27. 1 Cor. 1, 31.

XVII Κατὰ θέσιν, asseritur, nos *gratis* et ex *gratia Dei*, si nos respicias, justificari, Rom. 3, 24. Quod aliquatenus materiae rationem explet, ac debito meritoque operum nostrorum objicitur, Rom. 4, 4. 5. et 11, 6. Ita ut non tantum sine meritis, sed et contra demerita nostra nobis tribuatur, Rom. 3, 23. et 4, 5. 6. Eph. 2, 8.

XVIII Et quidem *Justitia Dei*, Rom. 1, 17. et 3, 24. 25. et 2 Cor. 5, 21. *quae sine lege*, Rom. 3, 21. *Justitia a Deo*, 1 Cor. 1, 30. *ex Deo*, Phil. 3, 9. scilicet non qua Deus in se* justus, sed quam nobis paravit, donat imputatque, Rom. 5, 15. opposita directe justitiae Legis, ac nostrae seu propriae, Jer. 23, 6. Rom. 3, 21. 22. et 10, 3. 2 Cor. 5, 21. Phil. 3, 9.

XIX Eaque *est Christi*, qui est *Justitia nostra*, Jer. 23, 6. et 33, 16. *factus nobis a Deo Justitia*, 1 Cor. 1, 30. *Justitia Dei in Christo*, 2 Cor. 5, 21. *in quo justificamur*, Gal.

die" (Genesis 2:17 and 3:3). For this reason "there could be no remission of sins without the shedding of blood" (Hebrews 9:22). Hence it says that we are justified "through" and "for the sake of Christ" (Romans 3:24). And this satisfaction is put directly opposite our works and their merits.

Regarding the material cause of justification we deny (to put it negatively) 15
that it consists of our works. For we are not justified "by the law, in the law, out of the law, or through the law" (Galatians 3:11 and 2:21); and we are justified "not by the law of Moses" (Acts 13:39), "not by works" (Romans 4:2; Ephesians 2:9), "not by works of the law" (Romans 3:20 and 9:32; Galatians 2:16), and "not by the law of righteousness" (Romans 9:31); and there is "not a righteousness of our own that comes from the law" (Philippians 3:9), it is "not our own righteousness" (Romans 10:3), and "it is not from works that we have done in righteousness" (Titus 3:5).

And in this manner "no-one is justified" (Romans 3:20; Galatians 2:16), not 16
Abraham the father of all believers (Romans 4:2), nor David, the man after God's heart (Romans 4:6), nor Paul that chosen vessel—even though in everything his conscience was clear (1 Corinthians 4:4; Philippians 3:8–9)—nor any of the saints (Psalm 143:2). But finally, there are those who justify themselves, but who do so wrongly (Luke 10:29 and 16:15). Expressed by its opposite, righteousness comes "apart from works" (Romans 4:6) and "apart from works of the law" (Romans 3:28). Justification excludes every righteousness that is according to the Law, whatever sort it might be and to whomever it might belong; and so it also excludes any boasting (Romans 3:27; 1 Corinthians 1:31).

And we assert (to put it positively) that as far as we are concerned we are 17
justified "freely" and "by the grace of God" (Romans 3:24); to some extent this makes up the material cause of justification, which is put directly over against what our works have deserved or merited (Romans 4:4–5 and 11:6). And so it is granted to us not just apart from any merits but even despite our demerits (Romans 3:23 and 4:5–6; Ephesians 2:8).

And indeed [the material cause] is the "righteousness that belongs to God" 18
(Romans 1:17; 3:24–25; 2 Corinthians 5:21), "that is apart from the law" (Romans 3:21), and "that is by God" (1 Corinthians 1:30) and "from God" (Philippians 3:9). That is to say, it is not the righteousness whereby God is righteous in himself,* but the righteousness that He has prepared and gives or imputes to us (Romans 5:15). It is directly opposite the righteousness of the Law, or our own proper righteousness (Jeremiah 23:6; Romans 3:21–22 and 10:3; 2 Corinthians 5:21; Philippians 3:9).

And this is the righteousness of Christ, who is "our righteousness" (Jeremiah 19
23:6 and 33:16), whom "God has made righteousness for us" (1 Corinthians 1:30). It is the "righteousness of God in Christ" (2 Corinthians 5:21) in "whom we

2, 17. et *in nomine Domini Jesu*, 1 Cor. 6, 11. *per Christum*, Rom. 5, 11. *per gratiam Jesu Christi*, Actor. 15, 11. *per redemptionem factam per Christum*, Rom. 3, 24. *in sanguine Christi*, Rom. 5, 9. Quae est illa ipsa justitia ex satisfactione Filii Dei, in sua amplitudine considerata, et passiva et activa, prout ὑπακοή, *obedientia*, παρακοῇ, inobedientiae, opponitur; eaque qua justificamur, opposita Legi, et nostrae, seu inhaerenti, Phil. 3, 9.

XX Attamen Lex seu *Justitia legalis* operumque, justitiae Dei in Christo, seu Christi, *non simpliciter adversatur*. Non enim justificamur contra legem; ut quam Christus implevit, tum patiendo poenas peccatis nostris debitas, quo culpam delevit, tum praestando omnem justitiam ac legis obedientiam, quo conditionem vitae aeternae posuit. *Sed certo respectu*, quoad plenam illius a Filio Dei pro nobis, non a nobis, quod requirebat insuper Lex, praestationem, Rom. 8, 3. 4. Gal. 3, 13. et 4, 4. 5.

XXI Forma est, tum in *applicatione ex parte Dei erga nos*, seu oblatione et collatione justitiae illius gratuitae Dei in Christo, seu λογισμῷ i. imputatione justitiae, Rom. 4, 11. dum *non imputat Deus peccatoribus peccata* quae habent, Ps. 32, 1. Rom. 4, 8. 2 Cor. 5, 19. sed ab iis *absolvit ac remittit peccata per Christum*, Act. 10, 43. et 13, 38. 39. atque *imputat justitiam*, quam non habent, Rom. 4, 3. 1 Cor. 1, 30. 2 Cor. 5, 21. Quae aliena Christi justitia fit nostra, et justi constituimur coram Deo, Rom. 5, 19. tum in *declaratione ac pronunciatione ipsius Dei*, qua habetur, censetur, ac judicatur quis justus in conspectu ejus, atque in conscientia sua, in qua Deus erigit tribunal suum, Rom. 4, 2. et 8, 33. 34.

XXII *Imputatio* autem haec non est figmentum, sed in aequitate, et Jure civili locum habet, ut quae statuit ut creditor idem jus habeat in sponsorem atque in debitorem. Quin cum sit vocabulum relativum,* *fundamentum** habet, non

are made righteous" (Galatians 2:17). And it comes "in the name of the Lord Jesus" (1 Corinthians 6:11), "through Christ" (Romans 5:11), "through the grace of Jesus Christ" (Acts 15:11), "through the redemption made in Christ" (Romans 3:24) and "in the blood of Christ" (Romans 5:9). It is that very righteousness which comes by the satisfactory work of the Son of God—seen in all its fullness (both active and passive) as obedience (*hupakoē*) placed over against disobedience (*parakoē*)—by which we are justified. It is placed opposite to a righteousness from the Law, and to our own, inherent righteousness (Philippians 3:9).

And yet the Law, or the righteousness of the Law and of works, is not 20
placed over against the righteousness of God in Christ, or over against Christ's righteousness simply as its opposite. For we are not justified contrary to the Law, for Christ has fulfilled it both by suffering the punishments owed for our sins, whereby he put an end to our guilt, and by presenting all righteousness and obedience to the Law, whereby he fulfilled what is required for eternal life. But the Law is opposed to righteousness in a certain respect, to the extent that the full payment for it was made by the Son of God for us and not by us ourselves, which was an additional requirement of the Law (Romans 8:3–4; Galatians 3:13 and 4:4–5).

The form of justification is in its application from the side of God towards us, 21
or in the bestowal and placement [upon us] of God's gratuitous righteousness in Christ, or in the *logismos*, that is, the imputing of righteousness (Romans 4:11), since "God does not impute to the sinners the sins that they have" (Psalm 32:1; Romans 4:8; 2 Corinthians 5:19) but "He forgives them their sins and remits them through Christ" (Acts 10:43 and 13:38–39), and He "imputes [to them] the righteousness they do not have" (Romans 4:3; 1 Corinthians 1:30; 2 Corinthians 5:21). This alien righteousness of Christ becomes our own, and so we are made righteous in the presence of God (Romans 5:19). The form of justification is also in the declaration and pronouncement by God himself, whereby He considers, deems, and judges someone righteous in his sight as well as in his own conscience, where God establishes his judgment-seat (Romans 4:2 and 8:33–34).

And this imputation is not some imaginary invention, but it has its proper 22
place in the concept of equity and in legal right which has established that a creditor has the same right towards the one who guarantees the surety as he does to the debtor.[11] Since imputation is a relational* term,[12] it has as its *basis**

11 Thysius here refers to Roman law that teaches that a *sponsor* can absolve a debt by paying the *creditor* for the *debtor*. In the first repetition of the *Synopsis* cycle Thysius refers to the discussion of the *fidejussors* in *The Institutes of Justinian* III.XX; see Thysius and Basirius, *De iustificatione hominis*, thesis 6. Cf. John Baron Moyle, *The Institutes of Justinian* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), 142–143.

12 According to scholastic logic, a 'relational term' is not an inherent quality, but a category

rem* inhaerentem ei cui fit imputatio, videlicet opus aliquod; *terminum,** mercedem; *relationem,** imputationem secundum debitum: ut sit quiddam in nobis, quod dignitate sua vel plena vel ex parte, imputetur ad justitiam, ut vox accipi videtur, Rom. 4, 4. nisi vocem aliam subjecto convenientem et respondentem subintelligi velimus, sed *fundamentum* statuitur in judicio et voluntate* imputantis seu reputantis Dei, non in nobis (in quibus contrarium est fundamentum,* non ad justitiam, sed iram, si Deus nobiscum intraret in judicium), *terminus* vero justitia fidei, seu Christi meritum, *relatio* autem *imputatio*, quae non fit secundum debitum, sed gratiam, ita ut idem sit quod acceptum ferre. Qualiter accipitur Rom. 4. decies, ubi prior ratio imputationis diserte removetur a negotio justificationis.

XXIII Mirum autem hic videri non debet *Christi justitiam* non *meritoriae* solum, sed et *materialis*, imo et *formalis* causae* rationem habere, cum id fiat diversimode, nempe qua illa est, propter quod, in quo seu ex quo, et per quod justificamur.

XXIV Haec *applicatio* in nobis fit a Spiritu S. 1 Cor. 6, 11. dono scilicet fidei. Ipse enim eam per ministerium Evangelii (quod *ministerium Spiritus* dicitur, 2 Cor. 3, 8.) ingenerat, ac Verbo suo et Sacramentis* confirmat et auget, Phil. 1, 26. Gal. 5, 5. Unde et *Spiritus fidei* dicitur, 2 Cor. 4, 13. qua Deum ut gratiosum, Christum ut Redemptorem, ejusque justitiam, et ex ea vitam aeternam apprehendimus, Joh. 1. 12. Rom. 9, 30.

XXV A parte ergo nostra, *fide*, Rom. 5, 2. Act. 26, 18. et *ex fide*, et *per fidem*, Rom. 3, 30. justificamur, et justificat nos Deus. *Fide*, inquam, *in Deum* et *in Jesum Christum Dominum*, Act. 26, 18. *ex fide in fidem*, Rom. 1, 17. et quidem *fide sine operibus* exclusive; *fide*, et non *operibus legis*, opposite; *et non nisi ex fide*, ac

---

that has a foundation, a term and a relation. For example, 'being a father' may be regarded as a foundation (the old man), a term (the child) and something in between them, 'fatherhood.' See Mark G. Henninger, *Relations: Medieval Theories 1250–1325* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989). See also Goclenius, *Lexicon philosophicum* (Frankfurt: Matthias Becker, 1613), s.v. "relatio." In the first part of thesis 22, Thysius thus affirms that, since 'imputation' is a relational term, it has a foundation, end-point, and relation, but denies that these three are to be construed 'according to debt.'

something* that is not inherent in the person to whom it happens (i.e., some deed); as *end-point** a reward; and as *relation** imputation according to what is owed—as if there is something within us that by virtue of its own full or partial worth is imputed for righteousness—as the word appears to be used in Romans 4:4 (unless we want to understand the word in a different sense that would fit and match the topic).[13] But the *basis* is situated in the judgment and will* of the God who imputes or ascribes [the righteousness], and not in us (for in us, on the contrary, the foundation* evokes wrath instead of righteousness, if God should enter into judgment with us); the *end-point* is the righteousness of faith or the merit of Christ; and the *relation* is an imputation which comes not by what is owed but by grace, in such a way that it is equal to being fully paid. Romans 4 uses it ten times in this way, and there the former meaning of imputation is explicitly removed from the matter of justification.[14]

And by this point it should not seem strange that the righteousness of Christ 23
has the character not only of a meritorious cause* but also a material and even formal one, since it works in different ways, namely as that cause because of which, in which or by which, and also through which we are justified.[15]

And as to the application, it is by the Holy Spirit that it comes about 24
(1 Corinthians 6:11), namely as a gift of faith. For it is the Spirit himself who ingenerates it through the ministry of the Gospel (called "the ministry of the Spirit" in 2 Corinthians 3:8), and he confirms and increases it through his Word and sacraments* (Philippians 1:26; Galatians 5:5). For this reason he is called also "the Spirit of faith" (2 Corinthians 4:13), by which faith we appropriate God as gracious, Christ as Redeemer, and we appropriate his righteousness, and from it life eternal (John 1:12, Romans 9:30)

And for our part, we are made righteous and God makes us righteous "by 25
faith" (Romans 5:2; Acts 26:18), "from faith," and "through faith" (Romans 3:30). I say "by faith in God" and "by faith in Jesus Christ the Lord" (Acts 26:18), "out of faith to faith" (Romans 1:17), and even by way of exclusion, "by faith without

13 In Romans 4:4 the verb 'to credit' or 'to impute' (*logizomai*) is used in the sense of the 'imputation' of obliged debt: "To the one who works, wages are not credited as a gift but as an obligation." This use, of course, differs from the imputation of the alien righteousness of Christ.

14 In Romans 4 the verb *logizomai* is used eleven times and only in 4:4 in the sense of the imputation according to what is owed. In that verse it functions in a counterargument: "the one who works" and thus deserves wages is opposed to "the one who does not work but trusts God who justifies the ungodly."

15 As meritorious cause the righteousness of Christ is that because of which; as material cause, that in which or by which; as formal cause, that through which we are justified. For the meritorious cause see also *SPT* 29.12.

tantum fide, id est, sola fide, Rom. 3, 28. 30. Gal. 2, 16. Luc. 8, 5. Unde etiam vocatur justitia haec, *justitia fidei*, Rom. 4, 11. 13. *justitia Dei ex et per fidem Jesu Christi*, Rom. 3, 22. et 9, 30. *justitia quae est ex Deo in fide*, Phil. 3, 9. Atque ea fides justitiaque ex fide, legi et operibus meritisque similiter opponitur.

XXVI Atque tum *fides* non modo doctrinam Evangelii, habitum* actionemque mentis, puta nudam notitiam et cognitionem Dei, Christi et Spiritus Sancti, sed et complexim voluntatis* actum,* Eph. 3, 12. 17. nempe fiduciam in Deum et Christum ac promissiones, de remissione peccatorum, justitia, vitaque aeterna, denotat: quas res* veras, et bonas et salutares, non universim modo, sed et κατ᾽ ἰδίαν, sigillatim sibi apprehendit, atque ita licet extraneas, suas facit, Matt. 9, 2. Rom. 4, 20. 21. quae *fides justificans* vulgo dicitur. Quando vero *notitiae* Justificatio tribuitur, Es. 53. Joh. 17, 3. synecdochica* et familiari Heb. loquendi ratione etiam fiduciam complectitur.

XXVII Justificamur ergo hac *fide*, ex *fide* et per *fidem*, imo ab Apost. *fides imputari* dicitur *ad justitiam*, Rom. 4, 3. 5. 6. 9. 11. 22. 23. 24. Non πρώτως καὶ κατ᾽ αὐτὸ, i. *primo et per se, ut qualitas** proprie,* aut motus, actio vel passio, aut opus aliquod bonum et eximii pretii, quasi ipsa sit justitia, aut ejus pars, aut etiam justitiae loco, ex censu et aestimatione Dei, sed δευτέρως καὶ κατ᾽ ἄλλο, *secundario et secundum aliud*, nempe *ut modus,* medium et instrumentum*, ceu oculus et manus, qua Christi ejusque justitiae participes reddimur, adeoque *relative** *ad objectum* Jesum, ipsius justitiam et promissiones gratiae, Phil. 3, 9.

works," or by way of its opposite: "By faith and not by works of the law." And "by nothing except by faith" and "only by faith," that is, by faith alone (Romans 3:28 and 30; Galatians 2:16; Luke 8:5). Therefore this righteousness is even called "the righteousness of faith" (Romans 4:11–13), the "righteousness of God by and through faith in Jesus Christ" (Romans 3:22 and 9:30), the "righteousness that comes from God in faith" (Philippians 3:9). And that faith and the righteousness from faith similarly is placed opposite the Law, works, and also merits.

So then 'faith' does not merely denote the doctrine of the Gospel, the habit* 26
and action of the mind (that is, a bare rational knowledge of God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit), but bound up with it is the act* of the will* (Ephesians 3:12, 17), namely trust in God and Christ and the promises about the forgiveness of sins, righteousness, and life eternal. And faith appropriates these real, good, and life-giving things* not just in general but in a particular way, to oneself individually, and even though they are external objects faith makes them one's own (Matthew 9:2, Romans 4:20–21). That kind of faith is commonly called "faith that justifies." But whenever 'justification' is assigned to knowledge (Isaiah 53[:11], John 17:3), then as an expression of a part for the whole* and by a common Hebrew manner of speaking it includes also trust.[16]

Therefore our justification is "by this faith, out of faith, and through faith." 27
The apostle even states that "faith is imputed for righteousness" (Romans 4:3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 22, 23 and 24). But faith does not act from its own initiative and by itself (*prōtōs kai kat' auto*), like some quality* in the proper sense,* or motion (whether active or passive). Nor does it act as some work that is good and of exceptional value, as though faith itself were righteousness or a part of it—or even, by the appraisal and evaluation of God, in the place of righteousness. But faith acts in a secondary place and following something else (*deuterōs kai kat' allo*), so that it is really the mode,* means, and instrument, or 'the eye and hand' whereby we are made partakers of Christ and his righteousness. Indeed, faith justifies in relation* to its object, Jesus, his righteousness and his promises of grace (Philippians 3:9).

16 In scholastic theology, for faith (*fides*) to be saving faith, it must comprise acts of the human intellect (knowledge and assent; *notitia* and *assensus*) and an act of the human will (trust, *fiducia*); see *SPT* 31.14–18. In this thesis, Thysius emphasizes that, although at times Scripture explicitly applies the concept of justification in relation to the first element of 'knowledge' alone (i.e. assent of the intellect or mind; cf. John 17:3: "Now this is eternal life: that they *know* you …"), in such cases we must—entirely in line with Hebrew usage—understand that it actually also includes the element of 'trust.' What matters is not just that I believe that God forgives and justifies in general, but that he forgives and justifies me. See also *SPT* 31.6, 23, 26.

XXVIII *Ea sola justificamur*, quia aliter apprehendi promissiones Dei, remissio peccatorum et aliena justitia, vitaque inde aeterna non potest;* neque aliud instrumentum monstrari, vel ex tota Scriptura, vel tota rei natura.* Non enim caritate aut bonis operibus haec ipsa accipiuntur, sed solam fidem Deus ad haec ordinavit.

XXIX Attamen ipsa non est *solitaria*, et sine obedientia, bonis operibus seu caritate vera et viva fides, Gal. 5, 6. ut quae ex regeneratione, quae fidem et resipiscentiam simul comprehendit, existit, et cum resipiscentia coexistit; eaque *corda mundari* dicuntur, Act. 15, 9. Ipsa itaque justificamur, non quae sit absque operibus, attamen absque operibus justificamur.

XXX Omnia ergo haec, *Deus justificans, sua gratia, gratis, gratiose;* et *propter, in* et *per Christum* ejusque *obedientiam* et *justitiam, justitiaeque imputatione* et *fide*, optime inter se cohaerent. Unum alterum ponit, praefert aut infert. Quibus ex aequo, sed tamen suo ordine, adversa sunt, salvari seu justificari ex *nobis*, ex *lege*, et per *legem, operibus, justitia nostra propriaque*, ex *debito* ac *merito nostro*. Adeoque non pugnant inter se gratuita Dei justificatio cum Christi merito, et Dei imputatione, aut cum his fides. Subalterna enim sunt, unde non obstat quo minus gratuita sit hominis justificatio ex mera Dei misericordia, et interveniat Christi meritum. Neque per illam aliud secluditur, quam opera nostra, non item Christi. Neque imputatio Dei gratuita absoluta* est, sed justitiae, puta Christi. Neque etiam *fides sua dignitate* censetur, sed *objecti*; aut aliud a merito Christi dicit, sed perceptionis ejus tantum modum.*

And we are justified by faith "alone," for it is not possible* in any other way 28
to appropriate God's promises, the forgiveness of sins, the alien righteousness, and thence eternal life. Nor can one point to any other instrument, either from all of Scripture or the whole of the natural* world. For these things are received not by love or good works, but for them God has appointed only faith.

But true and living faith is not something all on its own, unaccompanied 29
by obedience or good works or love (Galatians 5:6); for faith comes about by regeneration, which entails repentance together with faith. And faith coexists alongside repentance, and Acts 15:9 states that "our hearts are cleansed" by faith. And so while our justification comes by a faith that is not apart from works, yet it is apart from works that we are justified.[17]

And so all of the following [statements] are connected closely with each 30
other in a most excellent way: "It is God who justifies," "by his grace," "freely," "graciously," and "on account of and through Christ" and his "obedience," "righteousness," "by the imputation of righteousness" and "by faith." The one posits the other, or advances it, or infers it. At the same time, placed opposite to them and yet in their own order, are [the statements that] we are saved or justified "by ourselves, out of the law, and through the law, our works and our own proper righteousness," "by what is owed to us and what we have earned." Indeed, God's gracious justification does not conflict with the merit of Christ and its imputation by God; nor does faith conflict with these. For they are subalterns[18] and that is why the justification of man by God's mere mercy is not prevented from being gracious and Christ's intervention from being meritorious. And through it [i.e., God's free justification] nothing is excluded except our own works, not those of Christ. Nor is God's gracious imputation something absolute,* but it is the imputation of righteousness, namely the righteousness of Christ. And faith is judged not by its own worthiness but by the worthiness of its object. Or if

17 Thysius here reflects the dictum of Calvin in the *Acta synodi Tridentinae cum antidoto*: "It is faith alone (*fides sola*) that justifies; nevertheless the faith that justifies is not alone (*fides quae justificat non est sola*)," CO 7:477.

18 The term 'subaltern' stems from the logical 'square of opposition' and refers to the relation between a universal statement and a particular statement. A particular statement that is subaltern to a universal statement does not lead to a logical contradiction. For instance if you say that all trees have roots, you cannot say that some trees do not have roots, because that is contradictory, but you can say that some trees have roots, for then the second statement is subaltern to the universal statement. Thus the universal statement that we are justified by grace, does not exclude the subaltern statements that we are justified because of the merit of Christ and through faith. There would only be a contradiction if those latter statements implied that we were not justified by grace.

XXXI Unde sane longe dissimile est judicium et justificatio Dei ab hominum. Hoc justificari improbum, abominabile est coram Domino, Exod. 23, 1. Deut. 25, 1. Prov. 17, 15. quia agitur contra legem. Illo, justitiae consentaneum, quod fiat secundum legem interveniente Christi justitia, qua legi satisfit, quae nostra fit imputatione et fide. Quare dicit Apostolus, *fide*, seu *justitia fidei, non everti* sed *stabiliri legem*, Rom. 3, 31.

XXXII *Finis** porro justificationis nostrae, a Deo, in Christo per Spiritum, in fide, est *respectu Dei*, Dei gloria, ut Deus nos justificando se misericordem in Christo, ac potentem in Spiritu demonstret. Utriusque enim, et misericordiae et justitiae admirabile hic temperamentum relucet, Rom. 3, 26. et singularis Dei potentia,* Rom. 1, 16. 2 Thess. 1, 11. *Respectu* vero *nostri*, ipsa adeo salus nostra et vita aeterna, Rom. 1, 17. et 8, 30. Tit. 3, 7.

XXXIII Ex hisce causis* Justificatio, ut *effectus* existens, varios item fructus effectusque producit, ut sunt, *Pacificatio cum Deo*, et in conscientia, *aditus ad hanc gratiam,* perseverantia in eadem, gloriabunda spes vitae aeternae, gloriatio in afflictionibus, et gloriatio in Deo*, etc. Ad. Rom. 5, 1. 2. 11. et 3, 27. 1 Cor. 1, 31.

XXXIV *Subjectum** seu *objectum*, est *peccator et impius*, Rom. 4, 5. scilicet *in se*,* et in natura* sua, sed qui *ex fide et fidelis est*, Rom. 3, 22. 26. Act. 13, 39. Quinimo *electus*, et secundum propositum Dei vocatus, Rom. 8, 28. 30.

XXXV *Adjunctum proprium* seu *affectio ejus propria*, vel, ut alii, *proprius* ac necessarius effectus, est *sanctificatio*, Act. 15, 9. et *bona opera* inde promanantia, seu dilectio Dei et proximi, Gal. 5, 6. 1 Tim. 1, 5. Tit. 3, 8. quae licet imperfecta, tamen quod ad normam Legis sunt instituta, quodque ea fide Deo in Christo placent, *Justitiae* nomine* veniunt, a qua et *justi* appellamur, Act. 16, 35. 1 Joh. 2, 29. et

the word 'faith' says something other than Christ's merit, it only points to the manner* in which the merit of Christ is perceived.

Therefore the judgment and justification of God differs so much from that 31
of men. It is abominable in the sight of God that the wicked is justified by the judgment of men (Exodus 23:1; Deuteronomy 25:1; Proverbs 17:15), because it happens contrary to the Law. In the case that God justifies the ungodly, the judgment is in harmony with righteousness, because it happens according to the Law while Christ intervenes with a righteousness whereby he makes satisfaction to the Law, and that righteousness becomes our own by imputation and faith. Therefore the apostle says "by faith," or "by the righteousness of faith, the law is not overturned but established" (Romans 3:31).

As to the goal* of our justification by God in Christ through the Spirit and 32
in faith, it is, with respect to God, the glory of God, so that God in justifying us may show himself to be merciful in Christ and powerful in the Spirit. For an amazing combination of mercy and justice is conspicuous here (Romans 3:26), as is God's extraordinary power* (Romans 1:16; 2 Thessalonians 1:11). With respect to us, however, the goal is our very salvation and eternal life (Romans 1:17 and 8:30; Titus 3:7).

The justification that arises from these causes,* as it is an existing effect, like- 33
wise produces various fruits and [other] effects, and these include pacification both with God and in the conscience, and access to this grace,* perseverance in the same, a hope that exults in life eternal, a boasting in the midst of hardships, and a boasting in God, etc. (Romans 5:1–2, 11, and 3:27; 1 Corinthians 1:31).

The subject* or the object of justification is the sinner and the ungodly 34
(Romans 4:5), that is, the sinner in and of himself,* in his own nature,* yet one who lives "out of faith" or "a believer" (Romans 3:22, 26; Acts 13:39); indeed, one who is elect and called according to God's decree (Romans 8:28,30).

The proper adjunct of justification,[19] its proper affection, or, as others put 35
it, the proper and necessary effect of justification, is sanctification (Acts 15:9) and the good works that flow forth from it, and the love of God and one's neighbor (Galatians 5:6; 1 Timothy 1:5; Titus 3:8). Although these good works are imperfect, yet because they are undertaken by the norm of the Law and because by that faith they are pleasing to God in Christ, they go by the name*

19 The term 'proper adjunct' derives from Cicero's commonplaces (*loci communes*) and became prominent in Renaissance logic, especially in Ramist and Semi-Ramist works. A proper adjunct (*proprium adjunctum*) refers to an inseparable property of a logical subject deriving from, but not included in, its causal definition and essence (e.g. risibility in humans). See Petrus Ramus, *Dialecticae libri duo* (Paris: André Wechel, 1560), 45–48. See also *SPT* 37.38.

3, 7. 10. et quidem *coram Deo*, ob sinceritatem et integritatem; et *perfecti*, suo gradu et modo, Luc. 1, 6. etiam *nostra*, ut inhaerens nobis, per Spiritum Dei in nobis effecta: sed non est justitia illa Christi, quae fide nobis imputatur, aut ejus pars, ut quae ab illa distinguitur, Eph. 2, 9. 10. Nulla enim in fidelibus *justitia* operum, Rom. 3, 20. Gal. 2, 16. Attamen sunt in iis opera justitiae, Tit. 3, 5.

XXXVI Quin et his *justificatio, salus* et *vita aeterna* interdum, licet *improprie** tribuitur, Jac. 2, 21. 23. Matt. 12, 37. videlicet propter utriusque necessariam cohaesionem, fidei testificationem et declarationem, scilicet qua Justificatio evidentem probationem* et declarationem significat,* Jac. 2, 18. idque humano externoque judicio, Rom. 4, 2. 1 Cor. 4, 3. 4.

XXXVII In summa, *Deus Pater* nos justificat, ut Judex quidem, sed sedens in throno gratiae, ac peccata remittendo et justitiam imputando; *In Christo* justificamur, satisfaciente pro nobis et advocatum agente; *Per Spiritum Sanctum*, quatenus fidem tribuit et gratiam hanc in nobis obsignat; idque Evangelii praeconio, ut medio potentiae* Dei: *fide*, quae ipsius Dei Filiique justitiam apprehendit et suam facit: *Bonis* denique *operibus*, ut quae suae fidei justitiam demonstrant et declarant.

ANTITHESIS PONTIFICIA ET SOCINIANA QUAE A NOBIS UT VERITATI ADVERSA REJICITUR.

ANTITHESIS I.

Pontificii ex adverso, *Justificationem* non accipiunt vocabulo forensi, pro actione Dei Judicis, versantis circa objectum reum absolvendo; sed ex grammatica, eaque Latina compositione proprie,* pro motu ad justitiam, seu actione Dei hyperphysica, qua agit in subjectum* infundendo et indendo justitiae qualitatem,* seu qua ex injusto facit et constituit justum. Atque ita volunt

of 'righteousness.' And thereby we, too, are called 'the righteous' (Acts 16:35; 1John 2:29 and 3:7, 10) even in the sight of God, on account of our sincerity and integrity. And we are called 'perfect,' each according to his measure and manner (Luke 1:6). And the righteousness is even called 'our righteousness,' as a righteousness that inheres in us, having been effected in us by the Spirit of God. But it is not identical to the righteousness of Christ, which is imputed to us by faith, nor is it a part of it, since it is distinguished from it (Ephesians 2:9–10). For in the believers there exists no righteousness of works (Romans 3:20; Galatians 2:16). And yet there are works of righteousness in them (Titus 3:5).

In fact, justification, salvation, and occasionally even life eternal are attri- 36
buted to the works, although it is not attributed in the proper* sense (James 2:21, 23; Matthew 12:37). It is attributed because there must be a coherence between justification and the works, and because of the testimony and declaration of faith, that is to say, whereby justification means* the manifest proof* and declaration (James 2:18), also to the external human judgment (Romans 4:2; 1Corinthians 4:3–4).

In sum, God the Father justifies us as judge (to be sure), but He is seated on a 37
throne of grace, and He does so by remitting sins and imputing righteousness. It is in Christ that we are justified, as he performs the satisfaction on our behalf and acts as our advocate. We are justified through the Holy Spirit, in that he is the one who grants faith and seals this grace in our hearts; and he does so by the preaching of the Gospel as the means of God's power.* We are justified by faith, which appropriates the righteousness of God himself and of his Son and makes it her own. And lastly, it is by good works, as they display and declare the righteousness of our faith.

Antitheses of the Papal Teachers and the Socinians, Which We Reject as Contrary to the Truth[20]

The papal theologians, on the other hand, do not take the word 'justification' Ant. 1
as a forensic term for the action of God as judge that relates to an object in the absolution of his guilt. But they understand the term in its grammatical sense and as a proper* Latin compound word for the motion towards righteousness or a super-physical action of God whereby He works upon the subject* by infusing and imparting the quality* of righteousness, or whereby He makes and establishes the just out of the unjust.[21] And so, by mixing up justification with

20 The number of antitheses in this disputation is quite large, as the doctrine of justification was considered one of the main issues on which the Protestant and Roman Catholic views diverge and both differ from that of the Socinians.

21 Thysius opposes theologians who consider justification as implying an 'ontological

Deum *justificare effective*, contra vocis* in hoc negotio, saltem in Sacra Scriptura, usum, Justificationem cum regeneratione et sanctificatione confundentes: quod est πρῶτον ψεῦδος.

Ant. II Non tamen arbitramur, eos priorem illam significationem Justificationis hic plane secludere, sed eam ut illam sequentem etiam agnoscere; Deum nimirum jam justum factum, et juste viventem etiam justificare, id est, absolvere. Quam quidem aliqui restringunt ad extremum in extremo judicio actum,* quum etiam, et potissimum hoc sensu accipiatur in Justificatione in hac vita.

Ant. III Eam Justificationem dicunt praecedere necessariam quandam ejus *praeparationem*, factam partim a Deo, partim a nobis, nempe viribus humani arbitrii,* quibus homo vult et facit quod in se est. Atque haec opera praeparatoria *merito congrui* (quod tamen improprie* meritum esse dicunt, imo nonnulli vocem* improbant, quamvis rem cum aliis retineant) mereri Justificationem. Congruum enim divinae esse benignitati, ut facienti quod in sese est, succur-

---

change' within man, so that regeneration and sanctification are also subsumed under justification. The Council of Trent declares that "justification is not only the remission of sins, but also the sanctification and renewal of the inner person" and condemns with an *anathema* those who teach that justification is "either only by the imputation of Christ's justice or only by the remission of sins, without the grace and love that is poured out in their hearts through the Holy Spirit, and that inheres in them" (DH 1528 and 1561). For the medieval background see Thomas Aquinas, who asserts that justification is a change from a state of unrighteousness to a state of righteousness, from a state of corrupt nature to habitual grace and that there can be no remission of guilt without the infusion of grace (*infusio gratiae*) *Summa theologiae* 1/2.113.1–2.

regeneration and sanctification, they hold the view that God justifies effectively (contrary to the use of the word* in this matter, at least in sacred Scripture)—and that is 'the first lie.'[22]

However, we do not think that they are excluding altogether that first [forensic] meaning of justification here, but they consider it too as the second, subsequent one, namely that the one who has already been made righteous and lives justly is also justified by God; that is, God absolves him.[23] But there are some who limit this to the final act* of the final judgment, although it is also and especially taken in this sense of justification in this life.[24] Ant. 2

They state that some kind of preparation must precede that justification, a preparation made partly by God and partly by us, that is, by the powers of human choice* whereby man both wills and does what is within himself. And they say that these preparatory works deserve justification by the merit of congruity[25] (although they say that this is not properly* merit, and some even disapprove of the term,* while like the others they do retain the substance of it).[26] For it is congruous with God's kindness that He lends support to the Ant. 3

22 In Aristotelian logic *prōton pseudos*, the first lie, stands for a fundamental error, the first false premise in a deduction that is followed by other false statements, even if the argument is formally correct.

23 The colloquy in Regensburg (1541), in which Calvin participated, proposed a so-called 'double justification' to reconcile Catholic and Protestant views. According to this compromise, first there is an 'inherent righteousness' by the infusion of charity; but believers should not rely on this, since assurance of salvation only comes from 'imputed righteousness.' In the end, neither Luther nor the authorities in Rome found the solution satisfactory. For a brief summary see Anthony N.S. Lane, "A Tale of Two Imperial Cities: Justification at Regensburg (1541) and Trent (1546–1547)," in *Justification in Perspective: Historical Developments and Contemporary Challenges*, ed. Bruce L. McCormack (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 119–145.

24 It is not clear to which Roman Catholic theologians Thysius is referring here. According to McGrath, Andrés de Vega defined justification in terms of three elements: absolution from sin, possession of divine grace, and acceptance to eternal life. The third element might correlate to what Thysius calls "the final act of the final judgment" Cf. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, 327.

25 For the explanation of merit of congruity see *SPT* 31.35, note 50, and cf. *SPT* 32.6, and 34.38.

26 Trent states that this preparation occurs "by God's prevenient grace through Jesus Christ, that is, by his calling, by which they are called without there being any merits from their part …" (DH 1525–1526, 1532). During the council, the Thomist party, represented by Dominican Domingo de Soto, rejected any meritorious character of works done in preparation of justification. The Franciscan party, represented by Andrés de Vega, acknowledged these works had the merit of congruity. The Council fathers did not take a final stand on this issue. Cf. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, 319–321, 341, and 344–349. Some Roman Catholic the-

rat. At tantum abest, ut ulla meriti hic sit ratio,* ut Apostolus declaret, *quicquid sine fide fit, peccatum esse*, Rom. 14, 23. et *neminem sine fide Deo placere posse*, Hebr. 11, 6.

Ant. IV Hanc ordinariam praeparationem consequi volunt *justificationem* ipsam. quam distinguunt in *primam* et *secundam*, seu inchoatam et absolutam, incompletam et completam. Veruntamen justificatio unus actus* est, qui in instanti fit, quamvis suam habeat applicationem et continuationem, et sensum, quae gradatim et iterato fiunt, Rom. 8, 30. Unde quotidie precamur, *Remitte nobis debita nostra*, et confitemur, *Credo remissionem peccatorum*.

Ant. V *Primam* vocant, qua quis a Deo, habitus* novi infusione ex injusto fit justus, ex malo bonus, expellendo iniquitatem culpae, et dando rectitudinem justitiae. Qui actus* regenerationis est, non justificationis.

Ant. VI Hanc duo in se continere statuunt. Primo *remissionem peccatorum*, ut actum* praevium. Deinde *infusionem habitus* justitiae*, quo homo efficitur justus formaliter, dum acquirit potentiam* bene operandi, ac disponitur ad caritatem et alia bona opera. At vero justificationis actus non internus, sed externus vere est, et in remissione peccatorum ejus est forma.

Ant. VII *Secundam* autem, qua homo illis qualitatibus* instructus *acquisitione justitiae* revera fit justus, justa nempe operando, imo ex justo justior, id est, qua bonis operibus increscit, ac completur et consummatur in eo justificatio. Adeoque meretur majorem justitiam et vitam aeternam, idque ex *merito condigni*,

---

ologians used Trent's silence on this issue to affirm that one can say that the preparation has some merit of congruity for justification, e.g. Bellarmine, *De Justificatione* 1.21 (*Opera* 6:198a) and Stanislaus Hosius, *Opera omnia* (Paris: Cavellot, 1562), 93c.

one who does what he has within himself. But that is so far from being any reason* for merit that the apostle declares: "Whatever is done without faith is sin" (Romans 14:23) and "no-one is able without faith to please God" (Hebrews 11:6).

They think that justification itself follows upon this ordinary preparation, and they divide it into primary and secondary justification, or unfinished and finished, incomplete and complete justification.[27] But justification is one single act* that occurs in an instant, although it has its own application, continuation, and feeling, which come about by degrees and repeatedly (Romans 8:30). For this reason we daily pray "forgive us our sins" and we confess "I believe in the forgiveness of sins." Ant. 4

They call it the primary justification whereby God makes an unrighteous person into a righteous one by infusing a new habit,* and He turns the wicked into good by driving out the iniquity of his guilt and bestowing the uprightness of righteousness. But this is an act* of regeneration, not justification. Ant. 5

They posit that this [primary] justification entails two things. Firstly, the forgiveness of sins, as an act* that precedes. And thereupon it entails the infusion of the habit* of righteousness, whereby a man is formally rendered righteous, while he obtains the ability* of doing works well and he becomes inclined to love and to other good works. However, the act of justification is not an internal act but a truly external one, and its form is in the forgiveness of sins. Ant. 6

But the justification that they call secondary is the one whereby a man, having been equipped with those qualities,* actually does become a righteous man by the acquisition of righteousness. That is to say, by performing works that are just man becomes increasingly righteous; that is to say, hereby his justification grows by his good works and finds its completion and fulfillment in him. And so he merits a greater righteousness and life eternal, and he does so Ant. 7

27 In the chapter on the decree of justification, titled "On the growth of the received justification," the Council of Trent states that they who have been justified are still further justified, by mortifying the members of their own flesh and by presenting them as instruments of justice unto sanctification and that they increase in the received justice through faith co-operating with good works (DH 1535). This commonly was labelled as first and second justification. The Jesuit Francisco Suárez defines the first justification as the infusion of righteousness and the second as the growth of righteousness; see Suárez, *Opera* 9:127a, 397b. The position Thysius attacks differs from the 'double justification' mentioned in note 23. Here, Thysius has in mind the standard Roman Catholic view that justification is not only the instantaneous change from sinner to justified person, but also the following ongoing process of growth in justice. The expression 'double justification' can cover different theories; cf. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, 312–334.

quod vita aeterna merces in Scriptura dicatur. Attamen Scriptura negat justificationem ex operibus passim. Meriti quoque vox* Scripturae insolens, et vita aeterna accipitur sub ratione doni, et haereditatis jure, Rom. 6, 23. et 8, 17. 18. unde improprie* merces dicitur.

Ant. VIII Eamque *primo ac primario* constituunt in *caritate*, inde in *operibus ceteris*. At caritas effectus fidei, adeoque et justificationis est, 1 Tim. 1, 5.

Ant. IX Ac volunt *duplicem ordinem* seu gradum a Deo institutum ad justitiam, adeoque et justificationem: Primum *necessarium, in observantia praeceptorum Dei*, secundum illud, *Si vis vitam ingredi, serva mandata*; Secundum, non ita necessarium, sed *compendiosum et utilem*, ad majorem in beatitudine gradum, in *observatione consiliorum Evangelicorum*, secundum illud, (ut volunt) *Si vis perfectus esse, vade et vende quae habes, et da pauperibus*, etc. In quibus maxime collocant *Meritum supererogationis*. Verum illud est deformare Evangelium in Legem, hoc vero perfectiorem justitiam super legem comminisci.

Ant. X Cum ergo Apostolus dicit, *Deum peccatorem et impium justificare*, intelligunt, non quod remittantur ut reo peccata, et induatur aliena justitia, Christi scilicet; sed quod ex peccatore fiat *justus habitualiter et subjective*. Fatentur quidem, neminem posse* justificari absque remissione peccatorum facta propter meritum Christi, sed eam, ut praeviam, aut, ut alii, conjunctam, alii vero

through the merit of condignity* because Scripture calls life eternal a reward. But in fact Scripture everywhere rejects justification by works. And the word* 'merit' is also foreign to Scripture, and life eternal is received as a gift and by the right of inheritance (Romans 6:23 and 8:17–18); it is for this reason that life eternal is called a reward, though not in its proper sense.*

Ant. 8 And they place [secondary] justification first and primarily in love, and thereafter among the other works. Love, however, is an effect of faith and consequently it is an effect of justification (1 Timothy 1:5).

Ant. 9 They also want to think that God has established a twofold order or degree for righteousness, and so also for justification. The first one is "necessary, in the observance of God's precepts," in keeping with that statement: "If you would enter life, keep the commandments." And the second order, which is not so much necessary but "advantageous and useful" for a higher degree of blessedness, is "observance of the evangelical counsels,"[28] in keeping with that saying (as they would have it): "If you would be perfect, go and sell all that you have and give it to the poor, etc." And it is especially among these things that they place the 'merit of supererogation.'[29] However, the one is to deform the Gospel into Law, while the other is to invent a more perfect righteousness over and above the Law.

Ant. 10 Thus they think the apostle's statement that "God justifies the sinner and the ungodly" does not mean forgiving a guilty person his sins or being clothed in an alien righteousness (the righteousness of Christ), but from a sinner being made righteous as a disposition and personally. They do admit that no-one can* be justified without the forgiveness of sins that is done for the sake of Christ's

28 'Evangelical counsel' is "the advice or counsel of the church on various moral issues, defined by the medieval Scholastics as a higher obedience not commanded in the Law. Traditionally they are identified as poverty, obedience, and chastity, the three religious vows. Those who follow the counsels perform acts of merit and are given a greater certainty of salvation than those who merely follow the commands of the Law." *DLGTT*, s.v. "consilia evangelica." See also *SPT* 20.4, 26–46 and disputation 38 on vows.

29 In medieval moral theology, works of supererogation—such as obeying the 'evangelical counsels'—are virtuous acts that surpass what is required by duty or obligation. The 'evangelical counsels' became strongly associated with the three monastic vows of poverty, obedience, and chastity. In the Middle Ages, the 'supererogatory works' of Christ and the saints were thought to constitute a spiritual 'treasure of the Church,' from which the Church could grant indulgences, remissions of temporal punishments. It was one of the controversial issues between Catholics and Reformers. Cf. David Heyd, *Supererogation: Its Status in Ethical Theory* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 15–29; Carl Peter, "The Church's Treasures (*thesauri Ecclesiae*) Then and Now," *Theological Studies* 47 (1986): 251–272. See also *SPT* 34.31, and 37.16 and 20.

subsequentem, et non proprie* justificationem agnoscunt. Contra manifestum dictum Apostoli, Rom. 4, 5. *Ei vero qui non operatur, sed credit in eum qui justificat impium, imputatur fides sua pro justitia.*

Ant. XI Quod Apostolus dicit, nos *non justificari operibus Legis, sed sine operibus*, intelligunt de operibus Legis Ceremonialis, aut etiam Moralis, sed ante conversionem praestitis, non etiam Evangelii. At contra est exemplum Abrahami et Davidis, Rom. 4.

Ant. XII *Gratis et ex gratia Dei justificari* nos, fatentur, sed per *gratiam** intelligunt immeritam Dei actionem, qua nobis remittit peccata, et caritatis habitum* infundit, sive dona infusa per gratiam et misericordiam Dei; quae gratia illis habitualis et inhaerens dicitur. Atque ea intelligunt virtutes theologicas, Fidem, Spem et Caritatem. Verum gratia ita confunditur cum suo effectu, quum illa misericordiam Dei notet, Eph. 2, 4. et opponatur debito seu merito, Rom. 4. et 11. Gal. 5, 4.

Ant. XIII Per *justitiam Dei*, non intelligunt justitiam Christi, quam ipse praestitit, et Deus nobis largitur, sed a Deo infusam, et nobis inhaerentem; quum e contrario justitia Dei opponatur nostrae, ad Phil. 3, 9.

Ant. XIV *Per, et propter Christum, merito Christi et justitia Christi* nos justificari, fatentur, ita ut quidem justitia, qua justificamur, ab eo manet, quodque satisfactio quidem nobis applicetur, sed meritum et applicatio ejus non sint proxima,* completa et immediata* causa,* sed remotior,* qua Deus commovetur, ut nobis infundat habitum* caritatis, aliarumque virtutum, quo tamquam causa proxima et immediata, justificemur; seu impetrasse nobis Christum sua morte, ut

merit, however they do not consider that to be justification in the proper sense* but as a prior justification, or as some put it, 'conjoined justification,' and others, 'subsequent justification.'[30] But this is contrary to the apostle's clear statement, "but to the one who does not perform works but trusts in God who justifies the ungodly, faith is counted as his own righteousness" (Romans 4:5).

Ant. 11 They think that the apostle's statement, "we are not justified by works of the law but apart from works,"[31] is about the works of the ceremonial law, or even the moral law (performed, however, before conversion), and that are not yet works of the Gospel.[32] But that is contrary to the examples of Abraham and David (Romans 4).

Ant. 12 They do admit that we are justified "by grace" and "by the grace of God," but they understand the word grace* to mean an undeserved act of God whereby he forgives us our sins and infuses the habit* of love; or they take it to mean the gifts that are infused through God's grace and mercy; they call this grace habitual and inherent. And by that they mean the theological virtues of faith, hope, and love.[33] But in so doing they confuse grace with its effect, since grace means God's mercy (Ephesians 2:4) and is opposed to what is owed or merited (Romans 4 and 11; Galatians 5:4).

Ant. 13 They do not understand the term "righteousness of God" to be the righteousness that Christ himself has presented and God bestows on us, but a righteousness that God infuses in us and that is inherent in us. But to the contrary, Philippians 3:9 places the righteousness of God over against our righteousness.

Ant. 14 They do admit that we are justified "through and on account of Christ, by the merit of Christ and his righteousness," such that the righteousness whereby we are justified emanates from Christ and that the satisfaction is indeed applied to us, but that his merit and its application are not the proximate,* full, and non-mediated* cause,* but a more removed* one whereby God is moved to infuse the habit* of love and of the other virtues in us, whereby, as the proximate and non-mediated cause, we are justified. Or they say that by his death Christ has

30 The Roman Catholic sources of these phrases have not been located.

31 Galatians 2:16 and Romans 3:28.

32 See, for instance, Bellarmine, *De Justificatione* 1.19 (*Opera* 6:193a).

33 Next to the four cardinal virtues of temperance, prudence, justice, and courage, there are three theological virtues—faith, hope, and love—that dispose Christians to live in a relationship with God. According to Roman Catholic theology they are infused into the soul and make the Christian capable of acting in accordance to God's will. On the necessity of the infusion of the three theological virtues see, for instance, Suárez, *Opera* 9:391b.

induamur justitia inhaerente et caritate, cujus merito vitam et salutem impetremus. Atqui ita revera exinaniunt Christum cum sua satisfactione et merito.

Ant. XV *Imputationem justitiae*, seu *fidei in justitiam*, non intelligunt de reputatione Dei, qua loco Legalis justitiae, quae nobis inesse debebat, Christi obedientiam et justitiam ab illo pro nobis praestitam, nobis imputat, ac ita reputat pro justis (quam imputatam justitiam plane negant), sed volunt, interiorem novitatem, fidem et opera, seu justitiam inhaerentem, quamvis non sit perfecta in se,* et meritoria per se vitae aeternae, pro tali haberi. Quod est totam doctrinam Pauli de Justitia Dei, Christi et fidei, evertere, ac hominum opera ac merita reponere.

Ant. XVI *Fide* dum *justificari hominem* Scriptura dicit, intelligunt per fidem, nudam, generalem et implicitam quandam cognitionem, qua homo persuasus est religionem* Christianam universam atque Articulos fidei esse veros; adeoque excludunt a fide, fiduciam atque certitudinem salutis specialem, quam non nisi moralem agnoscunt, neque haberi nisi ex revelatione singulari. Quod est fidei notionem, prout accipitur in Scriptura, et naturam* et vim subvertere.

Ant. XVII Deinde nos *fide justificari*, non per se, quod fides sit in intellectu, et communis* etiam multis improbis, justitia vero in voluntate,* sed *synecdochice**

obtained that we should be clothed with inherent righteousness and love, by the merit of which we obtain life and salvation. But in so doing, with their own satisfaction and their own merit they actually make Christ powerless.[34]

Ant. 15 They do not take the "imputation of righteousness" or "of faith unto righteousness" to mean a reckoning by God whereby instead of the righteousness of the Law which we should have within us, He imputes Christ's obedience and the righteousness that Christ offered on our behalf, and so reckons us as just (which imputed righteousness they clearly deny), but they want that the inner renewal, faith, and works, or the inherent righteousness,[35] although it is not perfect in itself* nor of itself meritorious of life eternal, to be considered as such. To do so is to overturn Paul's entire teaching about the righteousness of God, Christ, and faith, and to put in its place the works and merits of men.

Ant. 16 When Scripture says that it is "by faith that man is justified," they take it to mean that it is some unfurnished, general, and implicit understanding whereby man is persuaded that the Christian religion* as a whole and the articles of the faith are all true.[36] And consequently they exclude from faith trust[37] and the special certainty of salvation, which they understand to be no more than moral and to come from a particular revelation alone.[38] And to do so is to overturn the idea of faith as Scripture takes it, as well as its nature* and strength.

Ant. 17 And next, they do not take our justification by faith as such (because faith resides in the intellect and is common* even to many wicked people, while righteousness is in the will*),[39] but they take it in the sense of a part representing

---

34 The Roman Catholic sources of these phrases have not been located.

35 Cf. Suárez, *Opera* 9:14a.

36 On 'implicit faith' see also Calvin, *Institutes* 3.2.2–6 and *SPT* 31.19.

37 According to Bellarmine, faith resides in the intellect and love in the will (*De Justificatione* 1.15, *Opera* 6:182b).

38 Bellarmine denies that anyone can be absolutely certain that his sins are forgiven without a special revelation and allows only a *certitudo moralis* or *conjecturalis*. See Bellarmine, *De Justificatione* 3.2 (*Opera* 6:249b), who follows the Council of Trent which denies that anyone can "know with a certainty of faith, which cannot be subject to error, that he has obtained the grace of God" (DH 1534). In this, Trent follows the view of Thomas Aquinas, expressed in *Summa theologiae* 1/2.112.5. Suárez makes a distinction between the certainty of divine faith, theological certainty and moral certainty. The first rests immediately on divine revelation, the second is a conclusion from divine revelation and evidence, the third is conjectural. Without a special revelation, the certainty of salvation is of the third kind. Suárez, *Opera* 9:525, 539a–541a. The certainty of salvation is also discussed in *SPT* 31.30, 39.

39 Bellarmine claims that faith (*fides*) differs from trust (*fiducia*); Bellarmine, *De Justificatione* 1.5 (*Opera* 6:155b). Suárez states that faith is not hope and therefore not properly trust, but an assent of the intellect. Suárez, *Opera* 9:401a. For the relation of faith to both intellect and will see *SPT* 31.14–16.

et metonymice, puta initialiter, partialiter, principaliter, et quatenus ad illum justificationis actum* caritate informatur, et reliquis virtutibus et bonis operibus vivificatur. Adeoque modum* applicationis Justificationis non ponunt in fide sola, sed et operibus. At vero caritate fides non informatur. Una qualitas* enim alterius non est forma. Neque fides et opera ad hunc actum simul concurrunt.

Ant. XVIII *Primam* itaque Justificationem *gratuitam* faciunt, *secundam* vero *meritoriam* salutis; sed virtute passionis Christi, seu (ut Jesuitae quidam loquuntur) quatenus opera nostra tincta sunt sanguine Christi.

Ant. XIX In summa, volunt *Deum justificare effective*, agendo in subjecto;* *Liberum Arbitrium*,* ut concausam; *Passionem Christi*, ut causam* meritoriam, scil. ut possimus mereri; *Gratiam Dei habitualem* formaliter; *Sacramenta*,* instrumentaliter, idque ex opere operato; *Sacerdotem*, ministerialiter, et quidem ut judicialiter agentem; *fidem* inchoative; *bona* denique *opera* perfective seu completive. Ac justitiam hic triplicem comminiscuntur, *innatam, infusam et acquisitam*, quibus singulis suas hic partes attribuunt.

Ant. XX Est itaque nobis cum Pontificiis quaestio primaria haec, *quae sit causa* justificationis principalis, proxima* et completa;* seu potius, *quid sit illud propter quid et quo, coram Dei tribunali integerrimo et perfectissimo, constituamur et judicemur perfecte justi?* An habitus* infusus Caritatis, et aliarum virtutum exercitium, an vero imputatio, id est, participatio meriti et satisfactionis a

the whole* and as a metonym (i.e., initially, partially, principally), and insofar as that act* of justification is formed by love and made alive by the other virtues and good works. And consequently they do not locate the mode* whereby justification is applied in faith only, but also in works. But in fact faith is not formed from love.[40] For the one quality* is not the form of another. Nor do faith and works concur together for this act.

Ant. 18 And so they make the first justification gratuitous while the second is meritorious of salvation, although it is by the strength of Christ's suffering, or (as some Jesuits say) insofar as our works have been washed by the blood of Christ.[41]

Ant. 19 In sum, they want "God to justify effectively" by acting in the subject;* they want the "free choice"* to act as a co-cause, the "suffering of Christ" as the meritorious cause,* namely so that we are able to merit. They take the "habitual grace of God" in the sense of a formal cause, the "sacraments"* as instrumental and as effective by the work performed,[42] the "priest" as ministering and even acting in a judicial sense.[43] They want "faith" to be a beginning cause, and lastly, "good works" to be a cause that perfects and makes complete.[44] And on this point they make up a three-fold righteousness: inborn, infused, and acquired, and to each of them they attribute its own proper parts.[45]

Ant. 20 Therefore the foremost point of debate between the papal teachers and us is: "What is the principal, proximate,* and complete cause* of our justification?" Or better: "On account of what thing, and by what thing is it that we, as we stand before God's most irreproachable and perfect tribunal, are considered and judged to be perfectly righteous?" Is it an infused habit* of love and the exercise of the other virtues? Or is it actually the imputation, that is, the participation, of the merit and satisfaction that Christ has given, so that

40 For the distinction between unformed and formed faith see *SPT* 31.27, note 45.

41 Hosius states that our works are stained by the blood of Christ (*Opera*, 49f).

42 In the context of sacraments, 'by the work performed' refers to the assumption that the correct ecclesiastical performance of the rite conveys grace, unless the recipient places an impediment in the way. It is contrasted with *ex opere operantis*, 'by the work of the performer,' which means that the effectiveness of the sacrament depends on the worthiness of the minister. Since Augustine's discussion with the Donatists, the former has been the orthodox position.

43 See also the summary of the causes of justification given by Bellarmine in *De Justificatione* 1.2 (*Opera* 6: 150–152).

44 See, for example, Bellarmine, *De Justificatione* 4.18 (*Opera* 6: 334a).

45 The threefold division derives from Scotus, *Ordinatio* 2.6.2.49 (*Opera omnia* 8:48–49). It does not seem to have played a significant role in sixteenth and seventeenth centuries' Roman Catholic theology.

Christo praestitae, adeoque Christi justitia per fidem nostra? illi istud, nos hoc constanter asserimus.

Ant. XXI Ab his non abit Sociniana impietas, quoad illud quo justificamur, quod statuit similiter obedientiam nostram; nisi quod ea, meritoriam justificationis causam,* (in quam omnes fere Christiani consentiunt,) neget esse Christi satisfactionem, quam nec necessariam, nec probabilem, imo impossibilem asserit, ac redemptionem tantum metaphoricam sine pretio comminiscitur.

Ant. XXII Quin fidem inepte non tantum fiduciam, sed et obedientiam praeceptorum Christi definit.

August. *Ad Psal.*130.[a]

Si iniquitates observaveris Domine, quis sustinebit? Non dixit, ego non sustinebo, sed quis sustinebit? Vidit enim prope totam vitam humanam circumlatrari peccatis suis, accusari omnes conscientias cogitationibus suis, non inveniri cor castum, praesumens de sua justititia. Si ergo cor castum non potest inveniri quod praesumat de sua justitia, praesumat omnium cor de misericordia Dei, et dicat Deo;[b] *Si iniquitates observaveris Domine, Domine quis sustinebit? Quae autem spes est? Quoniam apud te propitiatio est. Quae est ista propitatio, nisi sacrificium? Et quod est sacrificium, nisi quod pro nobis oblatum est? Sanguis innocens fusus delevit omnia peccata nocentium: pretium tantum datum redemit omnes captivos de manu captivantis inimici. Ergo est apud te propitiatio. Nam si non esset apud te propitiatio, si Judex solum esse velles, et misericors esse nolles, et observares omnes iniquitates nostras, et quaereres eas, quis sustineret? Quis ante staret? Et diceret innocens sum? Quis staret in Judicio tuo? Spes ergo una est, quia apud te est propitiatio.*

Bernardus, *Serm. 23. In Cantic.*[c]

Hominis Justitia est indulgentia Dei. Item, *Justitia Dei est non peccare: justitia hominis, est non imputari peccatum.*

---

[a] Augustine, *Ennarrationes in Psalmos* 129.2–3 (CCSL 40:1891). [b] Deo: omitted in Augustine's text. [c] Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermo XXIII in Cantica canticorum* 6.15 (*Sämtliche Werke* 5:344–346). This seems to be partly a citation, partly a summarizing paraphrase.

Christ's righteousness is ours through faith? The former is their claim, while we steadfastly affirm the latter.

Ant. 21 The ungodly teaching of the Socinians is no different from these, insofar as it concerns the thing whereby we are justified; for like them they hold that it was our own obedience—except that they deny that the meritorious cause* of justification (on which nearly all Christians agree) is the satisfaction made by Christ, which they claim is not necessary or likely, and even impossible, and they make up a metaphorical redemption, one that has no price.[46]

Ant. 22 In fact they wrongly define faith not merely as trust but also as obedience to Christ's precepts.

Augustine on *Psalm 130*

"If you should mark transgressions, O Lord, who would stand?" [Psalm 130:3]. He did not say "I shall not stand" but "who will stand?" For he observed that nearly all of our human existence is dogged by our own hounding sins, that our consciences are being accused by our thoughts, and that a clean heart which trusts in its own righteousness cannot be found. And so if a chaste heart that relies upon its own righteousness is not to be found, then the hearts of everyone must place their trust in the mercy of God and must say to God: "If you should mark transgressions, O Lord, who would stand?" What hope, then, can there be? "But with you there is forgiveness" [Psalm 130:4]. And what is that forgiveness, except that of a sacrifice? And what sacrifice is there except one that is offered on our behalf? It was the outpouring of innocent blood that blotted out the sins of all who were guilty, and the payment of so great a price delivered all the captives from the hand of the enemy who held them fast. "Therefore with you there is forgiveness." For if there were no forgiveness with you, if you should choose to be only a judge and not wish to be merciful, and if you should mark and search out all our iniquities, who could stand? Who could stand before you and say "I am innocent?" Who could stand in your judgment? Therefore there is only one hope, because forgiveness is only with you.

Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermon 23* on the *Song of Songs*

Man's righteousness is forgiveness by God. And while the righteousness of God consists in not sinning, the righteousness of man is that sin is not imputed to him.

---

46 For the metaphorical explanation of redemption by the Socinians see *SPT* 26.21, note 15. For their views on faith and justification see *SPT* 31.10, 29.

Idem, *Epist*. 190.[a]
Assignata est homini Justitia aliena, quia caruit sua.

[a] Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistola* 190.6.15 (*Sämtliche Werke* 3:29).

Bernard, *Epistle 190*

The alien righteousness was allotted to man because he lacked his own.

DISPUTATIO XXXIV

De Bonis Operibus

Praeside D. JOHANNE POLYANDRO
Respondente JOHANNE BACKER

THESIS I Fructus fidei convenientes resipiscentiae, sunt sancta et bona opera, quae ex semine regenerationis ac radice fidei justificantis nuperrime explicatae, enascuntur.

II Sunt autem bona opera regeneratorum actiones, quae fiunt juxta Legis divinae praescriptum, ex fide per caritatem efficaci, ad electionis et vocationis nostrae confirmationem, proximique aedificationem, ac Dei gloriam.

III Quae bonorum operum definitio, nec ad primos nostros parentes in statu innocentiae, nec ad eorum posteros Judaeos et Gentiles in statu corruptionis positos accommodanda est. Non ad illos, quoniam opera ipsorum ante lapsum, non ex fide justificante, sed ex justitia originali ipsis concreata proficiscebantur; nec ad hos, quia justitia illa originali per Adami lapsum destituti fideique in Christo radicatae expertes, ex sese fructus vere bonos proferre nequeunt.

IV Causa* efficiens hujusmodi operum, aut primaria est, aut secundaria. Primaria, seu κύριον αἴτιον, est solus Deus. Nam ut solus est Deus, ita ab ipso solo omne bonum primo descendit, Jac. 1, 17. Isque vel absolute,* vel relate consideratur. Relate quidem, quatenus tres personae* divinae, non minus ad haec

DISPUTATION 34

On Good Works

President: Johannes Polyander
Respondent: Johannes Backerius[1]

The fruits of faith that befit repentance are the holy, good works that are born from the seed of regeneration and grow from the root of justifying faith, which was explained very recently.[2] 1

Good works are the actions of regenerate people that come about according to the precept of God's Law, out of faith that works through love, for the confirmation of our election and calling, for the upbuilding of our neighbor, and to the glory of God. 2

We should not apply this definition of good works to our first parents in their state of innocence nor to their offspring—Jews as well as gentiles—while they are in the state of corruption. We should not apply it to our first parents, because their works before the fall into sin proceeded not from justifying faith but from the original righteousness with which they had been created. And we should not apply it to their offspring, for since they were deprived of that original justice through Adam's fall into sin and they lack the faith that is rooted in Christ, they are not capable in themselves of producing fruits that are truly good.[3] 3

The efficient cause* of works of this sort is either primary or secondary. The primary or principal cause is God alone. For as He alone is God, so it is from him alone that every good gift first comes down (James 1:17). And He may be considered as the cause either absolutely* or relatively. We may consider him as the relative cause inasmuch as the three divine persons* are connected in 4

1 Born c. 1599, Johannes Cornelii Backer (Van Lieburg: Johannes Bakker) came from Alkmaar and matriculated in philosophy on April 29, 1619. He defended this disputation in 1622. He was ordained as minister in De Waal and Oosterend (Texel) in 1625 and Oudkarspel and Noord-Scharwoude 1631; he died in 1642 and was buried in Alkmaar. See Du Rieu, *Album studiosorum*, 140, and Van Lieburg, *Repertorium*, 13.

2 Polyander first gives the definition of good works in theses 2–3, then their efficient and instrumental causes in theses 4–10, their matter or criterion (11–14), their form (15) and goals (16–18), comparison with pagan good works (19–22), non-essential properties (23–31), and he concludes by discussing and refuting the Roman Catholic doctrine of good works (32–50).

3 For original justice see *SPT* 13.40, note 20.

opera, quam ad alia, quae ad extra* vocantur, producenda essentialiter* sunt conjunctae, et pariter coordinatae.

v Quamvis ergo Deus Pater cum Filio cor hominis animalis in malo obfirmatum per Spiritum Sanctum emolliat, atque ad novam obedientiam legi suae conformem inflectat, nequaquam tamen Spiritus Sanctus in hac actione Patri et Filio, tamquam causa* instrumentalis principali, aut inferior superiori inservit, sed coaequali ad eam potestate cum utroque concurrit. Interim quia Spiritus Sanctus in hac actione personarum* divinarum ordine postrema est, nobisque proxima,* idcirco nostra bona opera fructus ipsius κατ᾽ ἐξοχὴν ab Apostolo nominantur, Gal. 5, 22. Ephes. 5, 9.

vi Causa* secundaria, est homo per Spiritum Sanctum renovatus, qui bona opera ex suo corde, tamquam ex proprio principio,* ac thesauro domestico foras producit. Hinc regeniti opus Dei vocantur conditi in Christo Jesu ad bona opera, quae praeparavit Deus, ut in iis incedant, Ephes. 2, 10.

vii Haec causa* ita pendet a praecedente, ut nullum opus bonum absque ea inchoari, aut confici possit. Siquidem opera quae a Deo inchoantur, ab eodem in nobis perficiuntur, et sicuti Spiritus Sanctus gratia* sua praeveniente novas nobis vires largitur, ut velimus et possimus bene operari; sic gratia sua subsequente efficit ut reipsa bene operemur. Utrumque Augustinus his verbis concinne exprimit, *Certum est nos renatos velle quae volumus, sed ille facit ut velimus, qui operatur velle. Certum est nos facere quae facimus, sed ille facit ut faciamus, qui operatur efficere*, August. *De Grat. et lib. arbit.* cap. 16.[a]

viii Proinde bona opera, quatenus Spiritus Dei ea non ex nostra, sed ex propria sua virtute in nobis operatur, ipsi soli sunt ascribenda; quatenus vero eadem

[a] Augustine, *De gratia et libero arbitrio liber unus* 16 (MPL 44:900–901).

essence* and coordinated on equal terms for producing these [inner] works as well as the other ones that we call outward.*[4]

And so although it is God the Father who with the Son softens the natural man's heart hardened in wickedness, and bends it towards a new obedience that conforms to his Law, yet the Holy Spirit is in no way subservient to the Father and the Son in this action as an instrumental cause* to a principal cause or as an inferior cause to a higher one; but he concurs with both of them for this action by a power that is co-equal to theirs. At the same time, because the Holy Spirit is the last person in this action according to the order of the divine persons* and the one closest* to us, for that reason the apostle calls our good works his fruits especially (Galatians 5:22; Ephesians 5:9).[5] 5

The secondary cause* is the person who has been renewed by the Holy Spirit, who brings forth good works from his own heart as from the proper principle* or starting-point, and he does so from his own personal store-house.[6] Hence those who are reborn are called God's work created in Jesus Christ for the good works which God had prepared beforehand, that they should walk in them (Ephesians 2:10). 6

This cause* depends so much on the first one that no good work can be started or completed without it. To be sure, the good works God begins in us He also completes, and just as the Holy Spirit by his preceding grace* bestows new strengths on us so that we become willing and able to do good works, so by his subsequent grace He brings it about that we do in fact work well.[7] Augustine skillfully describes the two graces with these words: "It is certain that we who have been reborn will what we will, but He who works the will sees to it that we do will. It is certain that we do what we do, but He who works to bring it about is the one who sees to it that we work" (Augustine, *On Grace and Free Choice*, chapter 16). 7

And so we should attribute good works only to the Holy Spirit, insofar as the Spirit of God works them in us not by our power but by his own. But insofar as 8

4 On the external works, common to all three divine persons see *SPT* 6.36, note 29, 7.21, note 11, 9.10, note 4, 10.8, note 7. On the doctrine of appropriation see *SPT* 8.7, 10.12, note 9, 22.10, note 9.

5 On the relevance of the order of the divine persons in the external work of our redemption see *SPT* 7.26, 9.21.

6 Matthew 12:35.

7 In medieval theology, 'preceding (or prevenient) grace' denoted the efficacy of God's grace before or apart from human will. 'Subsequent grace' denoted the working of grace together with human will. The origin of the terms is in Augustine, e.g. *Enchiridion* 9.32 (CCSL 46: 67). The distinction was usually equated with Augustine's distinction between 'operating grace' and 'co-operating grace.' See also, *SPT* 32.24, note 26; *DLGTT*, s.v. *"gratia."*

sic operatur, ut et nos ea operemur, nostra quoque, ut recte monet Augustinus, sunt nuncupanda. Vide Augustinum *Homil.* 93. *De tempore*.[a] E contrario, cum Spiritus Sanctus mala bonis nostris operibus admixta non efficiat, sed ea ex carnis vitio in hac vita nobis inhaerente promanent; non ea Spiritui Sancto, sed nobis solis attribui debent, ut ibidem monet Augustinus.

IX Causa* instrumentalis, aut interna est, aut externa. Instrumentalis interna est fides, per quam Deus corda nostra emundat, nosque Christo, non secus ac palmites, viti inserit, ut in ipso radicati, fructum multum proferamus, Act. 15, 9. Joh. 15, 5. Col. 2, 7. Unde fides Abrahami operum ipsius administra fuisse dicitur, Jac. 2, 22. et perseverantia in fide Jesu Christi, cum mandatorum Dei observatione conjungitur, Apoc. 14, 12.

X Instrumentalis externa, est verbi praedicatio, cujus ministerio Deus nos ad vitae novitatem fidei nostrae convenientem adhortatur atque impellit. Ideo Christus Evangelii sui praedicationem comparat cum semine, ac regenitos cum terra bona et ferace, Luc. 8, 15. ubi eos verbum* auditum in corde honesto ac bono retinere, fructumque per tolerantiam afferre asserit.

XI Materia simul et norma bonorum operum est, quicquid Deus noster Legislator nobis in Verbo suo praescribit, cujus epitome est lex moralis, index boni, quod Deus jubet atque ipsi placet, et mali, quod vetat ipsique displicet. Quam legem Deus per Prophetas in Vetere, per Christum ipsiusque Apostolos in Novo Testamento plene interpretatus est, ac ratione diversarum circumstantiarum, tum ad generalem totius suae Ecclesiae, tum ad particularem quorundam institutionem perfecte adaptavit.

XII Quemadmodum Deus est unicus Legislator, qui potest servare ac perdere, Jac. 4, 12. ita totum jus nobis creaturis suis normam pietatis, honestatis ac justitiae proponendi sibi vendicat, cum ait, Deut. 12, 32. *Unamquamque rem quam ego praecipio vobis, eam observantes facite; nec addito ei, nec detrahito ab ea*. Et Ez. 20, 18. 19. *In statutis Patrum vestrorum ne ambuletis, et jura illorum ne observetis. Ego sum Jehova Deus vester, in statutis meis ambulate, et jura mea observate*. Ex quibus constat, non nisi mandata ab ipso Deo opera esse facienda, ac pro bonis habenda.

XIII Ex bonorum igitur operum numero merito excluduntur, quae secundum traditiones Pontificiorum ex bona fiunt intentione, atque ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ seu

[a] It is not clear which numbering of Augustine's sermons Polyander uses. In the late seventeenth century, a new numbering of Augustine's sermons was introduced. The numbers 39 and 93 correspond with sermons 350 and 26 in the new numbering (see MPL 39:2433 for the renumbering index). These texts, however, do not cover the topic under discussion. Possibly the reference is to sermon 156, formerly numbered as 'sermon 13 On the words of the Apostle' in 'Sermones de novo testamento' (CCSL 41Ba:151–156) where Augustine attributes good works primarily to the Spirit and secondarily to us, while evil works are exclusively from our will.

he works them so that we, too, perform them, then we should call them also our works, as Augustine rightly points out (Augustine, Sermon 93, *On the Liturgical Season*). On the other hand, since the wicked deeds that are mixed in with our own works are not brought about by the Holy Spirit but flow forth from the carnal vices clinging to us in this life, we should not attribute them to the Holy Spirit but only to ourselves, as Augustine points out in the same passage.

The instrumental cause* is either internal or external. The internal instru- 9
mental cause is faith, through which God cleanses our hearts and engrafts us into Christ like branches onto the vine, so that rooted in him we should bring forth much fruit (Acts 15:9; John 15:5; Colossians 2:7). Therefore James 2:22 says that Abraham's faith was the 'handmaid' to his works; persevering in the faith in Jesus Christ is linked with the keeping of God's commands (Revelation 14:12).

The external instrumental cause is the preaching of the Word, and by admin- 10
istering it God exhorts and drives us on towards the newness of life that befits our faith. Thus Christ compares the preaching of his Gospel with a seed, and those who have been reborn with good and fertile soil, in Luke 8:15, where he affirms that they keep the word* that they have heard in hearts that are good and honest, and by perseverance bring forth fruit.

The subject-matter, which at the same time is the rule for determining works 11
that are good, is whatever God our lawgiver prescribes for us in his Word, of which the moral Law is a summary, the indicator of the good that God commands and finds pleasing, and of the evil that He forbids and finds displeasing. In the Old Testament God explained it clearly through the prophets, and in the New Testament He did so through Christ and his apostles, and He adapted it perfectly because of varying circumstances to the general instruction of his church as a whole and to the specific instruction of certain people.

And just as God is the one and only lawgiver who is able to save and 12
to destroy (James 4:12), so too does He demand for himself every right to put before us, his creatures, the rule for piety, honesty, and righteousness (Deuteronomy 12:32): "Be careful to observe everything that I command you, and you shall neither add nor subtract from it." And Ezekiel 20:18–19: "You shall not walk in the statutes of your parents, nor keep their laws. I am the Lord your God; you shall walk in my statutes and keep my laws." From these it is clear that we must perform only those works which God himself has commanded, and we must consider only them as good.

Therefore it is right not to reckon among the number of good works those 13
that according to the traditions of papal teachers are done from good intentions, or from self-willed worship (*ethelothrēskeia*),[8] even though they possess

8 On self-willed worship, a term derived from Colossians 2:23, see also *SPT* 19.3 and 21.12.

cultu voluntario, tametsi aliquam sapientiae et submissionis animi rationem habeant, splendidoque Apostolicae atque Ecclesiasticae institutionis titulo adornentur, Esa. 29, 13. Matt. 15, 9. Col. 2, 22. 23. Cujus generis sunt vota et jejunia monastica, cultus Sanctorum, peregrinationes ad eorum monumenta, et similia, quae nullam cum operibus pietatis cognationem habent.

XIV Omnia enim opera pietatis lege Dei praescripta ad adorationem solius Dei, at Sanctorum cultus et invocatio ad creaturarum quoque venerationem religiosam referuntur. Adhaec, omnia pietatis opera lege Dei imperata, sunt absolute* bona et necessaria, ab omnibus et singulis hominibus praestanda; at Monachorum vota sunt (*ipsis Pontificiis confitentibus*) arbitraria, paucisque tantum, qui sponte se ad ea obligant, praestabilia, etiamsi ab istis cum majoris meriti ac praemii promissione exigantur.

XV Forma bonorum operum est ἐννομία, seu exacta, omnibusque suis partibus cum norma legis divinae ἁρμονία vel congruentia, tum quoad eorum integritatem integram, tum quoad speciem eorum externam. Cum enim Deus sit καρδιογνώστης, secundum veritatem judicans, et lex ipsius spiritualis, non tantum quoad dicta et facta, sed etiam quoad cogitata et desideria, nostras actiones legi Dei conformes esse oportet, Rom. 2, 2. 7. 14. Phil. 1, 10.

XVI Fines* bonorum operum sunt tres. Quorum primus ad nos spectat, testificatio scilicet nostrae erga Deum gratitudinis, qua nostra simul electio et vocatio in nobis confirmantur, Rom. 12, 1. 2. 1 Cor. 6, 19. 20. 2 Pet. 2, 5. 9. 10. Et enim de nostra electione et vocatione ex bonis operibus tamquam ex hostiis Deo acceptis, fideique justificantis notis indubitatis, de nostra electione atque adeo vocatione ad salutem, certiores reddimur, ut liquet ex hac Petri admonitione, 2 Pet. 1, 10. *Quapropter fratres studete vocationem et electionem vestram firmam efficere; haec enim si feceritis, nunquam impingetis*. Nec non ex Christi promissione, Joh. 15, 8. qua auditores Evangelii ex fructibus bonorum operum certo cognituros pollicetur, quod germani ipsius sint discipuli ac palmites, ipsi vere in aeternum insiti.

some wisdom or humility of heart and are crowned with the impressive title of apostolic and ecclesiastical instruction (Isaiah 29:13; Matthew 15:9; Colossians 2:22–23).[9] Works of this sort are the monastic vows and fasting, adoration of saints or pilgrimages to their shrines, and similar works; these have no real connection at all to works of piety.

14 For all the works of piety that God's Law has prescribed lead to the adoration only of God, but worshipping and calling upon saints leads also to a superstitious veneration of creatures. Added to that is the fact that everyone, all individuals included, is required to present all the works of piety commanded by God's Law; they are absolutely* good and necessary. But the vows of monks (as the papal teachers themselves admit) are arbitrary and preeminent only for a few people who voluntarily bind themselves to doing them, notwithstanding the fact that it is with the promise of greater merit and reward that they are commanded to do them.[10]

15 The form of good works is their integral conformity, or their exact harmony and congruence, with the rule of God's Law in all of their parts, insofar as their inner soundness and also their outward appearance is concerned. For since God knows the hearts and judges according to the truth, and since his Law is a spiritual one—not just pertaining to words and deeds but also to thoughts and desires—our actions should conform to the Law of God (Romans 2:2, 7, 14; Philippians 1:10).

16 Good works have three goals.* The first of these concerns us, namely, the testimony of our thankfulness towards God, whereby both our election and calling are confirmed in us (Romans 12:1–2; 1 Corinthians 6:19–20; 2 Peter 1:5, 9 and 10). For it is by our good works that we are rendered more certain of our election and calling unto salvation, as the works are like sacrifices acceptable to God, and like undoubted marks of justifying faith, as Peter's word of encouragement makes clear: "Therefore, brothers, be eager to make your calling and election firm, for if you do this, you will never stumble" (2 Peter 1:10). And there is also Christ's promise in John 15:8, where the hearers of the Gospel are assured that by the fruits of good works they will know more certainly that they are his genuine disciples, vine-branches forever engrafted into Christ.

---

9 Roman Catholic theologians taught that apart from divine instructions in Scripture there are also 'unwritten' traditions, either derived from the apostles or formulated later by the Church; see also *SPT* 4.3, 26–39. These traditions may be about doctrinal or moral issues; they may be universal or local, valid permanently or temporarily, and necessary or free. Cf. Bellarmine, *De Verbo Dei* 4.2 (*Opera* 1:195–197).

10 For these supererogatory works see thesis 31 and following below.

XVII Secundus finis* est proximi aedificatio, sive sit fidelis, sive infidelis. Cum enim bene faciendo, aliis ἀπρόσκοποι, id est, sine offendiculo praeimus, fideique nostrae sinceritatem palam ostendimus, tum fidelis in eadem fide nobiscum confirmatur; infidelis autem, vel ad eam allicitur, vel pudefit, si bonam nostram in Christo conversationem nihilominus incessit, 1 Cor. 10, 32. ut Lactantius eleganter colligit, lib. 5. *Instit.* cap. 9.[a] *Cum videant*, inquit, *infideles et se et suos ea quae diximus gerere, nostros autem nihil aliud operari nisi aequum et bonum, poterant si quid saperent, ex hoc intelligere, et illos qui bonum faciunt, esse pios, et se impios qui nefanda committunt; neque enim fieri potest, ut qui in omnibus vitae suae actionibus non errant, in summa errent, id est in religione,* quae rerum omnium caput est.*

XVIII Tertius finis* atque ultimus, cui duo praecedentes subordinantur, est Dei gloria. Sunt enim regeniti in hoc mundo ac medio nationis pravae a Deo constituti, non tantum ut ipsi irreprehensi et sinceri Deum, tam operibus, quam ore suo glorificent, sed ut, tamquam luminaria, alios omnes luce bonorum suorum operum ad Deum glorificandum provocent, Matt. 5, 16. Phil. 2, 15. Joh. 15, 1. Atque hic finis cum praecedentibus nexu individuo conjunctus, cum iisdem bona opera suo ordine sequitur, et propterea communi cum illis nomine,* nunc illorum fructus, nunc usus, nunc effectus appellatur.

XIX Ad illam bonorum operum definitionem abunde explicatam, si morales ac civiles Gentilium virtutes examinentur, nequaquam, ceu bonae, apud Deum laudari a nobis possunt, aut debent, cum nulla pars illius definitionis ipsis conveniat. Nam neque ipsorum virtutes a Spiritu regenerationis proficiscuntur,

[a] Lactantius, *Institutiones divinae* 5.9 (CSEL 19/1:429).

The second goal* of good works is the upbuilding of our neighbor, whether 17
he is a believer or unbeliever. For when in doing good we cause no offense to others, that is, when we lead the way for others without being a stumbling-block and we show openly that our faith is sincere, then the believer is confirmed in the same faith as we are. The unbeliever, however, is either won over to it or he is put to shame by it, if he nonetheless reproves our good walk in Christ (1 Corinthians 10:32).[11] Lactantius sums it up elegantly when he says: "When unbelievers see that they and their people do those things which we have said, but that ours practice only that which is just and good, if they had any sense they might have perceived from this that those who do what is good are pious, and moreover that they themselves, who commit wicked actions, are impious. For it is impossible that they who do not err in every action of their lives, should err in the main point, that is, in religion,* which is the chief of everything" (*Divine Institutes*, book 5, chapter 9).

The third and final goal* of good works, and the one to which the other 18
two are subordinate, is the glory of God. For God has placed the regenerate in this world and in the midst of a crooked generation, not only so that they themselves might be blameless and sincere when they bring glory to God with their works and with their speech, but also so that like shining lights they might by the light of their good works incite all others to bring glory to God (Matthew 5:16; Philippians 2:15; John 15:1[–8]). An unbreakable bond unites this goal to the preceding ones, and together with them it comes in due order in the wake of good works; for this reason it is called by the same name* as they are, sometimes their fruit, or their use, or their effect.

When the moral and civil virtues of the gentiles are put to the test in light of 19
the definition of good works as we have fully explained it, then there is no way whatsoever that we can applaud them as works that are good in God's sight—nor should we, because no part of that definition applies to them.[12] For their

11 In 1 Corinthians 10:32 the Greek word *aproskopos* 'no offense' occurs. The reference here is also to 1 Peter 3:16.

12 Polyander's discussion in theses 19–22 closely reflects the Augustinian doctrine of the splendid vices (*splendida peccata*). This derives from Augustine of Hippo, although the precise term is not found in his works. Augustine held that true virtue must always be directed towards the end of loving God. He argued explicitly that this could not be achieved without faith and charity ordering moral intention, and, at least by implication, without the operative help of God's grace. This implies that all pagan (i.e. non-Christian) virtues must be regarded as counterfeit and therefore sinful, and this is generally (although not universally) accepted as his view; see *Contra Julianum*, 4.17–25, MPL 44.745–751; *De Civitate Dei*, 19.25, CSEL 40/2:420; *De Diversis Quaestionibus ad Simplicianum*, 1.2.2, CCSL

cum sint carnales, neque ex fide justificante, sine qua impossibile est Deo placere, cum Christi justitiam, aut ignorent, aut repudient; neque ex vera caritate, cum haec sit fidei manus, qua agit, quae Deus lege sua efflagitat; nec ea ab ipsis fiunt propter Deum, qui est finis* universalis, et cum aeterna operantium salute conjunctus, sed propter finem* aliquem particularem, qui cum ipsorum vita in hoc seculo terminatur, nimirum, aut ad lucrum, aut ad favorem popularem, aut ad honores civiles sibi comparandos.

XX Non tamen infidelium virtutes sunt absolute* aut per se malae, sed secundum quid et per accidens.* Bonae enim sunt materialiter, ac nude consideratae; malae sunt radicaliter et formaliter. Radicaliter, quatenus ex malo et impuro corde emanant; formaliter, quatenus aliter fiunt, quam oportet.

XXI Propterea Cyprianus virtutes Gentilium infidelium falsas vocat virtutes, Hieronymus vitiosas, Augustinus ad enuntiatum Pauli respiciens, Rom. 14, 23. ipsum peccatum, cum ait: *Quantumlibet opera infidelium praedicentur, Apostoli sententiam veram novimus, omne quod non est ex fide*, nempe ex mandato Dei, et justitiae Christi innitente, *peccatum est. Si Gentilis nudum operierit, nunquid quia non est ex fide, peccatum est? Prorsus, in quantum non est ex fide, peccatum est; non quia per se ipsum factum, quod est nudum operire, peccatum est, sed tali opere non in Domino gloriari, solus impius negat esse peccatum*. Cyp. Lib. 1. *De-*

44:24–25. Cf. Terence H. Irwin, "Splendid Vices? Augustine for and against Pagan Virtues," *Medieval Philosophy and Theology* 8 (1999): 105–127. The extreme lines of this Augustinian doctrine were rejected by Thomas Aquinas, who held that non-Christians could attain genuine virtue without faith and charity, but not true virtue in a strict sense. See his *Summa theologiae* 1/2.65.2; 2/2.10.4; 23.7. Cf. Jennifer Herdt, *Putting on Virtue: The Legacy of the Splendid Vices* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008), 72–97. Like Aquinas, most medieval theologians tended to reject the stark Augustinian understanding that *all* pagan virtues were splendid vices, but the doctrine resurfaced in the late medieval Augustinianism of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Cf. Gregory of Rimini, *Commentary on the Sentences* 2.26–28.1.3, Gregory of Rimini, *Lectura super primum et secundum Sententiarium*, ed. Damasus Trapp and Venicio Marcolino (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1980–1981), 4:74, 85. While rejected by the Roman Catholic Church, and explicitly condemned at the Councils of Constance and Trent, it became a prominent theme for the Protestant Reformers. See, for example, Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.14.2–3. In the era of Reformed scholasticism, despite a comprehensive rehabilitation of scholastic virtue ethics, the doctrine continued to retain widespread influence. While it continued to be expressed within a characteristic Augustinian framework, it was also frequently recontextualized within a specifically Protestant framework of human depravity and divine imputation of righteousness. See, for example, Peter Martyr Vermigli, *Commentary on the Nicomachean Ethics*, Peter Martyr Library 9, Emidio Campi and Joseph McLelland (eds.) (Kirksville: Truman State University Press, 2006), 26–27.

virtues do not proceed from the Spirit of regeneration, since they are carnal, nor do they proceed from justifying faith (without which it is impossible to please God), since they either ignore or reject the righteousness of Christ. Nor do those virtues proceed from true love, since love is the 'hand of faith' whereby faith does what God demands in his Law. And the gentiles do not perform these works for the sake of God, who is the general goal* that also is connected to the eternal well-being of those who do the works. Instead, they do them for some specific goal* that ceases along with their life in this age, that is, for personal gain, to win popular acclaim, or to obtain civic honors for themselves.

20 And yet the virtues of unbelievers are not absolutely* wicked, or wicked in and of themselves; they are wicked in a certain respect, and by accident.* For they are good in a material way and when they are considered simply in themselves. But it is from the root on up that they are wicked, and so too in their form. From their root, because they emanate from a heart that is wicked and impure; in their form, because they are performed differently than they should be.

21 It is for this reason that Cyprian calls the virtues of pagan unbelievers false virtues, and Jerome calls them corrupt, while Augustine, with an eye to Paul's statement in Romans 14:23, calls them "sin itself," when he says: "Regardless of how much we predicate about the works of unbelievers, we know that the Apostle's saying is true, that whatever does not come from faith, i.e., from God's command and resting upon Christ's righteousness, is sin. If a gentile should provide clothing for the naked, is it then sin because it was not done out of faith? Yes indeed, to the extent that it was not done out of faith it is sin. It is sin not because the very act of clothing the naked is a sin, but because in work of this kind the boasting is not in the Lord; it is only the impious who denies that

bono patientiae.[a] Hieron. cap. 3. *Ad Gal.*[b] August. *De gestis Palaestinis*, cap. 14.[c] et *Contra Jul.* lib. 4. cap. 3.[d]

XXII Verum enimvero eaedem ob alios respectus, partim bonae sunt, partim malae. Bonae, quatenus vi Spiritus pravitatem ipsorum internam comprimentis, utiles sunt ad vitae praesentis honestatem, ad consequendam benedictionem temporalem, et mitigationem poenae aeternae; Malae, quia inutiles sunt ad obtinendam vitam sempiternam. Quod August. Romanorum exemplo illustrat, in *Epist. ad Marcellinum*,[e] *Rempublicam*, inquit, *primi Romani constituerunt auxeruntque virtutibus, etsi non habentes veram pietatem erga verum Deum. Ac Deus sic ostendit in opulentissimo et praeclaro imperio Romano, quantum valerent civiles etiam sine vera religione* virtutes, ut intelligeretur hac addita fieri homines cives alterius civitatis, cujus rex est veritas, lex, caritas, modus, aeternitas*. Et *Contra Jul.* lib. 4. cap. 3.[f] *Minus Fabricius quam Catilina punietur, non quia iste bonus, sed quia ille magis malus; et minus impius, quam Catilina, Fabricius, non veras virtutes habendo, sed a veris virtutibus, non plurimum deviando*.

XXIII Adjuncta bonorum operum sunt tria, necessitas,* integritas et dignitas.

XXIV Necessitas* bonis operibus multifariam attribuitur. Necessaria enim dicuntur, 1. Necessitate praecepti divini. 2. Necessitate medii ad Dei gloriam et salutem nostram ordinati. 3. Necessitate cultus et obsequii Deo ex obligatione nostra naturali* debiti. 4. Necessitate bonae et tranquillae conscientiae, de sua electione et vocatione ad salutem sibi probe consciae. 5. Necessitate officii caritatis proximo praestandi.

XXV Necessitatem* efficientiae, quam *Pontificii* praecedentibus adjungunt, ut spuriam repudiamus, quia bona opera nec ad salutis inchoationem, quae consistit in remissione peccatorum, nostraque cum Deo reconciliatione, nec ad ejus consummationem, quae posita est in aeterna glorificatione, ac plena immortalitatis futurae fruitione, veluti causae* efficientes, sunt necessaria. Nam nos-

---

[a] Cyprian, *De bono patientiae* 1 (CCSL 3A:118). [b] Jerome, *Commentariorum in Epistolam ad Galatas* 1.3–2.3 (MPL 26:346–370). [c] Augustine, *De gestis Pelagii* 14 (CSEL 42:89). [d] Augustine, *Contra Julianum* 4.3 (MPL 44:753–754). [e] Augustine, *Ep.*138.17 (CSEL 44:144–145). [f] Augustine, *Contra Julianum* 4.3 (MPL 44:753–754).

it is sin" (Cyprian, *On the Virtue of Suffering*; Jerome, *Commentary on Galatians*, chapter 3; Augustine, *On the Palestinian Proceedings*, chapter 14, and *Against Julian*, book 4, chapter 3.)

22 To be sure, in other respects those deeds are partly good and partly wicked. Good, because by the power of the Spirit who restrains the corruption within them they are useful for the respectability of the present life, for obtaining temporal happiness, and for the mitigation of everlasting punishment. But they are evil because they are of no use for obtaining everlasting life. Augustine illustrates this with the example of the Romans, in his *Letter to Marcellinus*, where he says: "The early Romans established the Republic and advanced it with virtues, even though they possessed no true piety towards the true God. And in this very opulent and illustrious Roman empire God shows that even without true religion* civic virtues are capable of so much that one would understand that when the true religion is added people would become citizens of another state where truth is king, love is the law, and eternity is the way of life." And in *Against Julian* book 4 chapter 3 he writes: "Fabricius will receive a lesser punishment than Catiline, not because the former was good, but because the latter was more evil; and Fabricius was less wicked than Catiline, not for having real virtues but for not deviating as much from real virtues."[13]

23 Good works possess three adjunct properties: necessity, integrity, and dignity.[14]

24 Necessity* is considered an attribute of good works in many ways. Good works are called 'necessary': 1) by the necessity of the divine command; 2) by the necessity of the means ordained for God's glory and our salvation; 3) by the necessity of the worship and obedience we owe to God out of our natural* obligation; 4) by the necessity of a good and tranquil conscience that is rightly conscious of its own salvation and calling unto salvation; 5) by the necessity of the duty to show love to our neighbor.

25 The papal teachers add the necessity* of efficiency to the preceding ones, but we repudiate it as false because good works are necessary neither for the beginning of salvation (which consists in the forgiveness of sins and our reconciliation with God) nor for its consummation, which finds its place in eternal glorification and the full fruition of the future immortality, as if they

13 Gaius Fabricius was a Roman consul at the end of the third century BC. Cicero mentions him as an example of true Roman virtue. Catiline was a political opponent, whom Cicero depicted as an archetypal villain.

14 These attributes of good works are supplemental or non-essential in the sense that they are not necessarily properties of good works, but are still important aspects to be considered.

tram per fidem coram Deo justificationem consequuntur, atque haereditatem nobis in coelis paratam tantummodo, ut via ac conditio in haeredibus requisita, praecedunt.

XXVI Nec contrarium ex ipsis Sacrae Scripturae locis, quibus *Pontificii* ad astruendam suam commentitiam sententiam abutuntur, probari* potest: quorum alia qualitatem* indicant, vel conditionem ab iis requisitam, quibus vita aeterna promittitur, Hebr. 10, 36. etc. alia fidei notam et viam, qua ad vitam aeternam pervenitur, ut Matt. 25, 35. Jac. 1, 25. et 2, 14. alia fructum et effectum inchoatae salutis, atque in peccatorum remissione consistentis, ut Luc. 7, 47. etc.

XXVII Integritas bonorum operum est, qua omnia quae Deus lege sua a nobis postulat, ex puro et toto corde, atque ex omnibus viribus nostris praestamus, quae alio nomine* perfectio* integritatis et partium nominatur.

XXVIII Aliam perfectionem,* nempe graduum, nec Sacra Scriptura, nec experientia agnoscit. Utraque enim testatur, etiam sanctissimorum hominum opera in hac vita deprehendi imperfecta, variisque naevis aspersa, si ad perfectionem illam, quam lex Dei a nobis efflagitat, exigantur.

XXIX Scriptura sanctorum hominum fidelium opera, triplici potissimum de causa imperfecta esse declarat. 1. Ob regenerationis eorum statum, et modum* in hoc seculo, qui talis est, ut nova quotidie capiat incrementa, neque ad extremum perfectionis gradum ante extremum hujus vitae halitum perveniant. 2. Ob reliquias pravae concupiscentiae ipsis vitio carnis perpetuo adhaerentis. 3. Ob assiduam luctam inter carnem et spiritum, tanquam inter hostes in eodem campo concertantes, ex quorum mutuo conflictu mixtae utrimque actiones oriuntur, quae ex intentiore qualitate,* vel spiritus, vel carnis opera vocantur.

were efficient causes.*[15] For they follow our justification in the sight of God through faith and they precede the inheritance that has been prepared in heaven for us only as a way and a required condition in the inheritors.

And it is not possible to prove* the opposite from those very places in sacred Scripture which the papal teachers misuse to spread abroad their own fabricated opinion. Some of the passages show the quality* or condition required of those who are promised eternal life (Hebrews 10:36, etc.). Other passages show the mark and way of faith whereby one reaches eternal life (as in Matthew 25:35; James 1:25 and 2:14). And other places point out the fruit and effect of the salvation that has begun and that consists in the forgiveness of sins (as in Luke 7:47, etc.). 26

The integrity of good works is that by which we, from an entirely pure heart and with all our strength, present everything God demands from us in his Law. By another name* this is called the perfection* of the integrity and the parts. 27

Neither sacred Scripture nor experience recognizes any other perfection,* such as the perfection of degrees.[16] For both of them testify that the good works of even the most holy men in this life are found to be imperfect, spotted with a variety of blemishes if they are examined in light of the perfection which the Law of God demands from us. 28

Scripture declares that the works of holy, believing people are not perfect for three reasons especially. 1) On account of the state and the mode* of their regeneration in this age, which is such that it grows in small increments daily, and the works do not reach the final degree of perfection* until after the last breath of life has been taken. 2) On account of the remnants of depraved concupiscence that continually clings to them by the vices of the flesh.[17] 3) On account of the constant struggle between flesh and spirit, which is like that of enemies fighting with each other on the same battlefield; from their mutual conflict mixed actions arise, which are called either works of the spirit or of the flesh, because of the quality* at which these works aim. 29

---

15 Bellarmine argues that good works are necessary for salvation, not merely with a 'necessity of presence' (*necessitas praesentiae*), but also with a 'necessity of efficiency' (*necessitas efficientiae*). Good works must have some kind of causal efficacy in realizing salvation: *De Justificatione* 4.1, 4.6–9 (*Opera* 6:294–296, 311–318). Nevertheless, he also states that penance and obedience to the Law, which cause salvation, are gratuitous gifts of God (ibid. 4.2; *Opera* 6: 296–301).

16 'Perfection of degrees,' also called 'perfection of eminence' means absolute perfection.

17 On concupiscence see *SPT* 15.8, 26, 30.

XXX Ob has causas Prophetae et Apostoli passim attestantur, nullum omnino merum hominem reperiri qui praecepta legis, ad eam quam exigit mensuram, impleat, Ps. 143, 2. Rom. 7, 7. et seq. Rom. 8, 3. Jac. 3, 2.

XXXI Contrarium perfectionarii sustinent, ac sigillatim Pontificii, qui tantas regenitis vires ascribunt, ut eas non tantum legi divinae implendae pares, sed etiam ad plura, et magis ardua quam lex efflagitat, nempe ad opera supererogationis praestanda, sufficientes esse affirment.

XXXII Ne autem absque Scriptura loqui videantur, quam plurima illius proferunt testimonia,* ex quibus perperam haec tria consectaria eliciunt, 1. Legis observationem sanctis in hujus vitae stadio esse possibilem. 2. Opera carnis, quae justis sanctorum operibus admiscentur, non esse peccata mortalia legi repugnantia, sed delicta venialia praeter legem commissa, ac proinde justitiae ipsorum legi consentaneae non officere. 3. Sanctos plura et majora praestare posse, quam ex legis praeceptis teneantur.

XXXIII Testimonia* Scripturae quibus primum suum consectarium probare* satagunt, ab ipsis perperam citari, his demonstramus* argumentis. Primo, quod nusquam locorum ab ipsis productorum agatur de mandatorum Dei observatione, aut justitia sanctorum universali legi divinae secundum graduum perfectionem* ad amussim respondente; sed alia loca testentur de studio et conatu obedientiae universalis, seu de justitia inchoata, gradibus quidem incompleta, sed legi, quoad animi sinceritatem, omnesque obedientiae partes, conformi, ut Jos. 11, 15. 1 Reg. 14, 8. 2 Reg. 23, 25. 2 Chron. 15, 12. Ps. 119, 11. Luc. 1, 6. Act. 13, 22. Alia vero de justitia sanctorum particulari, aut causae,* ut Ps. 7; 27. et 119. aut facti, ut Ps. 106, 30. Secundo, quod alia agant de illorum officio qui ad perfectionem* justitiae universalis aspirare tenentur, ut Joh. 14, 21. Rom. 13, 8. Gal. 5, 14. Col. 4, 12. 4. Alia de majore provectiorum prae ceteris progressu, vel in

For these reasons the prophets and apostles testify everywhere that no 30
entirely pure man is to be found who fulfills the precepts of the Law to the level that it requires (Psalm 143:2; Romans 7:7–8; Romans 8:3; James 3:2).

But those who support perfectionism [in the degrees of good works], in 31
particular the papal teachers,[18] maintain the opposite view when they assign so much power to the regenerate that they are equal to fulfilling the Law of God, yet also are capable of achieving even more works, ones much more arduous than the Law's demands—that is to say, works of supererogation.[19]

In order not to appear to be speaking without Scriptural support, they bring 32
forward very many prooftexts* from it, which they wrongly draw up into these three conclusions: 1) It is possible for saints in the 'arena' of this life to keep the Law. 2) The works of the flesh, which are mingled with the righteous works of the saints, are not deadly sins incompatible with the Law, but they are pardonable sins committed outside the Law, and therefore they do not impede the compatibility of their righteousness with the Law. 3) The saints are capable of performing even more and greater works than they are bound to do by the precepts of the Law.[20]

With the following arguments we shall demonstrate* that they incorrectly 33
are citing those prooftexts* with which they struggle to prove* their first conclusion. The first is that not one of the places they adduce deals with keeping God's commandments, or the general righteousness of the saints that corresponds to God's Law precisely according to the perfection* of the degrees. Instead, some places testify to the zeal and effort of obedience in general, or of righteousness that has been undertaken yet is incomplete in degrees, but which conform to the Law insofar as sincerity of heart and all the elements of obedience are present (Joshua 11:15; 1 Kings 14:8; 2 Kings 23:25; 2 Chronicles 15:12; Psalm 119:11; Luke 1:6; Acts 13:22). Other places deal with the specific righteousness of the saints, or causes* (Psalm 7, 27, and 119), or deeds of righteousness (Psalm 106:30). The second argument is that some places deal with the duty of those people who are held to aspire to the perfection* of universal righteousness (as in John 14:21; Romans 13:8; Galatians 5:14; Colossians 4:12). And other

18 Besides the Roman Catholic forms of perfectionism, Polyander may have in mind some Anabaptists, who were alleged by the Reformed of holding the possibility of a sinless life. On the issue see Kenneth Ronald Davis, *Anabaptism and Asceticism: A Study in Intellectual Origins* (Scottdale: Herald Press, 1974), 135–145. Arminius, too, had been accused of perfectionism by some of the Reformed. See Den Boer, *God's Twofold Love*, 14.

19 For the 'works of supererogation' see *SPT* 33 antithesis 9, note 29 and *SPT* 37.16 and 20.

20 Bellarmine discusses the righteousness of the works and of the possibility of keeping the Law in *De Justificatione* 4.11 (*Opera* 6:319–321) and defends it in subsequent chapters. Most of the biblical references mentioned by Polyander below are cited by him.

cognitione fidei, ut 1 Cor 2, 6. Hebr. 5, 14. vel in ejus praxi, ut Phil. 3, 15. Jac. 3, 2. Tertio, quod promptam crucis tolerantiam nobis commendent, ut et alacrem mandatorum Dei exsecutionem, Matt. 11, 30. 1 Joh. 5, 3.

XXXIV Quam prave secundum Pontificiorum consectarium ex Apost. Johannis testimonio,* 1 Joh. 3. 9. deducatur, ipsa illius loci collatio cum sequente, 1 Joh. 5, 8. ostendit. Posteriore enim loco Apostolus sui ipsius interpres, priorem non de quovis peccato, sed peculiariter de peccato ad mortem accipiendum esse innuit; cum regenitos illius peccati immunes esse asseverat, alioqui prior Apostoli enunciatio, nimirum 1 Joh. 3, 9. esset contradictoria superiori, 1 Joh. 1, 8. qua neminem peccati expertem esse asserit.

XXXV Tertium ipsorum consectarium falso quoque nititur fundamento.* Nam sicuti Scriptura mandata Christi singularia, quae ratione muneris aut doni singularis quibusdam tantum praescribuntur, nullibi vocat consilia mandatis legis moralis perfectiora: sic nec opera pietatis, aut continentiae aut caritatis ab iis solis qui ea acceperunt, praestanda, uspiam opera supererogationis nuncupat, sed officia, vel Deo juxta primam, vel proximo juxta secundam decalogi tabulam debita, ut in sequente disputatione de votis ostendemus.

XXXVI Dignitas bonorum operum, non ex illorum merito, uti volunt *Pontificii*, sed ex sola Dei gratia, ut docet Evangelium, aestimanda est. Nam si Deus illa secundum legis suae rigorem examinaret, censura potius ob imperfectionem suam digna essent, quam favore ac beneficio ipsius; quae Deus tamen propter Christum Filium suum dilectum, omnes nostras infirmitates, sua justitia perfecta contegentem, nostraque opera ut fructus Spiritus in nobis per fidem operantis ipsi nostro nomine offerentem, ex throno gratiae suae paternae acceptare, gloriaque aeterna coronare dignatur.

XXXVII Praeterquam quod opera nostra ex interna sua dignitate nihil apud Deum mereri posse* ex ipsorum imperfectione liquido apparet, idem 4. rationibus* sequentibus probari* potest. Quarum prima est, quod opera illa ad praemium

places deal with the greater progress of those who have surpassed others either in knowledge of the faith (1 Corinthians 2:6; Hebrews 5:14) or in the exercise of it (Philippians 3:15; James 3:2). And the third argument is that they encourage us promptly to endure the cross and to carry out God's commandments eagerly (Matthew 11:30; 1 John 5:3).

34 A comparison of the testimony* of the apostle John (1 John 3:9) with the one which follows (1 John 5:8) shows how wrong the papal teachers are in drawing their second consequence from it. For in the latter passage, wherein he interprets his own statement, the apostle indicates that the earlier passage should not be understood as concerning any sin whatsoever, but the sin unto death in particular, for he asserts that those who have been reborn are immune to that sin, otherwise the apostle's earlier pronouncement (in 1 John 3:9) would be contradictory with the previously made statement in 1 John 1:8 which asserts that no-one is without sin.

35 The third consequence they draw also rests upon a false foundation.* For in no place does Scripture call Christ's specific commands (which are prescribed only for certain particular individuals because of their function or a special gift) 'counsels' that are more perfect than the commandments of the moral Law, nor does it anywhere apply the name 'works of supererogation' to those works of piety, abstinence, or love that must be presented only by those people who have received them.[21] It calls them 'duties' that are owed either to God (according to the first table of the Law) or to our neighbor (according to the second table of the Law), as we shall show in a later disputation, the one on vows.[22]

36 We should assess the dignity of good works not by their merits (as the papal teachers would have it) but only by God's grace, as the Gospel teaches. For if God were to test them against the rigor of his Law, then because of their own imperfection they would be worthy of censure rather than his favor and beneficence. God, seated on his throne of fatherly grace, deigns to accept these works and to crown them with eternal glory for the sake of Christ his beloved Son, who covers all our weaknesses with his own perfect righteousness, and who on our behalf presents our works to the Father as fruits of the Spirit who is working in us through faith.

37 Besides the fact that their own imperfection clearly reveals that our works cannot* merit anything in God's sight by their own inner worthiness, there are the four following arguments* that can prove* the same. The first of these is

21 On the so-called 'evangelical counsels' see *SPT* 33 antithesis 9, notes 28 and 29.

22 The next disputation presided by Polyander is disputation 38, where he defines the vows as duties towards God. See *SPT* 38.3, 53.

futurae vitae promissum, nullam aequalitatis proportionem habeant, cum illa sint finita et temporaria, istud autem infinitum* atque aeternum.

XXXVIII Quocirca si Apostolus Paulus momentaneas sanctorum martyrum, ob nomen Christi perpessiones coelestis gloriae remuneratione modis infinitis* praeponderari asseverat, Rom. 8, 18. idem de eadem remuneratione nostris promissa actionibus, quae minoris, quam S. Martyrum perpessiones sunt faciendae, multo magis affirmari debet; ac tantum abest, ut ex isto Apostoli effato distinctio Pontificiorum inter meritum de congruo ac condigno recte erui possit, ut nullum ad eam evertendam sit accommodatius. Etenim si inter opera ac pretium regni coelestis nulla datur aequalitatis analogia,* nec illa meriti, neque hoc compensationis ex justitiae aequabilis aestimatione tribuendae rationem habet.

XXXIX Secunda ratio* est, quod opera bona, quatenus sunt bona, a Spiritu Sancto (ut antea declaravimus thesi 7.) proficiscantur, eoque nostra proprie* non sint opera, sed gratuita Dei dona quae a nobis prolata, ipsi idcirco sunt accepta, quod ea non ex nobis, sed ex ipso habeamus, eaque tamquam Spiritus ipsius organa ipsi offeramus, ut recte observavit Augustinus *Hom.* 39. *De tempore*.[a]

XL Tertia ratio* est, quod nostra opera sint debita, quae Deus, ut supremus atque unicus dominus, cui nos nostraque omnia debemus, a nobis jure exigit; si opera nostra Deo ut domino nostro debentur, iis sane nihil apud Deum promereri possimus, atque e contrario si sunt meritoria, non sunt ex jure dominii ipsi debita. Atqui ea ex jure dominii Deo deberi Christus hac monstrat similitudine a servo desumpta, Luc. 17, 9. 10. *Num Dominus gratiam habet servo qui fecit, quae ipsi praecepta fuerant? non puto. Ita et vos, cum feceritis omnia, quae praecepta sunt vobis, dicite, servi inutiles sumus; nam quod debuimus facere, fecimus*.

XLI Quarta ratio* est, quod nostris operibus nihil Domino Deo largiamur, quod ipsius benignitatem sic praevertat, ut aliquid ipsi accedat, cujus beneficio se

[a] Possibly the reference is to sermon 156 (CCSL 41Ba:151–156). See the footnote on a similar reference in thesis VIII above.

the fact that for the promised reward of the future life the proportion of those works is not at all equal,[23] since they are finite and temporary while the reward is infinite* and eternal.

38 If the apostle Paul asserts concerning this that the brief sufferings which the saintly martyrs endure for the sake of the name of Christ are outweighed in countless* ways by the reward of heavenly glory (Romans 8:18), then we should make the same assertion even more about the same reward that is promised for our actions, which we must perform and which are less than the sufferings of the holy martyrs. And the claim by the papal teachers that the distinction between merit of congruity and condign merit can be rightly drawn up from this statement by the apostle is so far from the truth that it would be best for us to reject it altogether.[24] For if there is no equal proportion* between works and the reward of the heavenly kingdom, then good works have no merit, nor is the reward a compensation that is to be provided based on an assessment of a proportionate righteousness.

39 The second reason* is that good works, to the extent that they are good, proceed from the Holy Spirit (as we have declared earlier in thesis 7) and therefore they are not properly* our works but gracious gifts of God that were brought forward by us. They are acceptable to God because we have them not from ourselves but from him, and we, as instruments of his Spirit, present them to God, as Augustine has rightly noted (Sermon 39, *On the Liturgical Season*).

40 The third reason* is that our works are owed, and it is by right that God requires them of us, as He is the supreme and only Lord to whom we owe ourselves and all that we have. If our works are owed to God as our Lord, then surely we can earn nothing from God by them; but if on the contrary they are meritorious, then they are not owed to him by his right of lordship. But in fact they are owed to God by his right of lordship, and Christ shows this by the parable of the slave: "Will the master thank his servant because he did what he was told to do? I think not. So you also when you have done everything you were told to do, should say 'we are unworthy servants, we have only done what we ought to have done'" (Luke 17:9–10).

41 The fourth reason* is that with our works we do not bestow on the Lord God anything that by its priority lessens his goodwill in such a way that He

23 The mathematical expressions 'equal proportion' (*proportion* or *analogia aequalitatis*) here and in thesis 38 below refer to the relationship between equal numbers, for instance 3 to 3 or 5 to 5. In aesthetics it was seen as the basis of beauty. For a different application of the concept of equality see *SPT* 37.29.

24 On the distinction between 'merit of congruity' and 'condign merit' see *SPT* 31.35, note 51. Cf. *SPT* 32.6, and 33 antithesis 3.

nobis obstrictum censeat. Quae ratio* a Christo cum proxime praecedente conjungitur, Luc. 17, 10. cum ait nos hoc respectu esse Dei servos inutiles; eademque nobis ob oculos ponitur, Job. 35, 7. *Si justus es, quid das Deo? aut quid e manu tua accipit?* Et 41, 2. *Quis praevenit me*, inquit Dominus, *et rependam? Quicquid subest toti coelo, meum est.* Item Rom. 11, 35. *Quis prior dedit ei, et reddetur ei. Nam ex eo, et per eum, et in ipsum sunt omnia.*

XLII Quibus addi potest, quod non minus vox* ipsa, meritum, quam doctrina meritoria sit nova, nec unquam ab ipsis Dei amanuensibus θεοπνεύστοις usurpata. Quamvis Ecclesiasticus non sit ex horum numero, ideoque nec apud nos testis sit αὐτόπιστος, hoc tamen monebimus, quod vox ab ipso posita, cap. 16. v. 13. nimirum, ἔργα, opera denotet, non autem merita, ut censent Pontificii, qui pravam Latini interpretis versionem sequi malunt, quam genuinam textus originalis interpretationem a nobis monstratam amplecti, sicuti ex loco quoque ad Hebr. 13, 16. apparet, ex quo ut meritum suum de condigno exstruant, verbum* εὐαρεστεῖται, malunt exponere cum vetere interprete per verbum* *promeretur*, quam nobiscum per verbum* *delectari*, tametsi hoc potius, quam illo, Apostoli mentem exprimi, nemo Graecae linguae peritus, simulque orthodoxus negaverit.

XLIII Non minus absurde vox,* *merces*, quae saepissime in sacris literis reperitur, ad stabiliendum idem meritum affertur, cum nunquam salus animarum, aut vita aeterna nostris operibus tamquam merces debita, sed tamquam remuneratio indebita ac gratuita in Evangelio promittatur, ideoque nunc finis fidei, ut 1 Pet. 1, 9. nunc donum Dei, ut Rom. 6, 23. nunc denique haereditas, nobis ex gratia adoptionis Christi cohaeredibus in coelis servata, appelletur, ut 1 Pet. 1, 4.

gains some benefit for which He should consider himself under obligation to us. Christ links this reason* to the immediately preceding one (Luke 17:10) when he says that it is in this regard that we are God's unworthy servants. And Job 35:7 presents the same thought for us to read: "If you are righteous, what do you give to God? Or what does He receive from your hand?" And Job 41:2: "Who has come before me, says the Lord, that I should repay him? Whatever is under the whole heaven is mine." And similarly Romans 11:35: "Who has ever given to God that God should repay him? For from him and through him and to him are all things."

To these reasons we may add that the very word* 'merit' itself is just as 42
strange as 'doctrine about merits,' and it is used nowhere by God's inspired scribes.[25] And although Jesus Sirach is not counted as one of them and therefore in our view not a self-authenticating witness,[26] yet we shall point out that the [Greek] word *erga*, which he uses in Chapter 16:13, means 'works' and not merits, as the papal teachers think, who prefer to follow the bad rendering of the Latin translator than to cling to the authentic meaning of the text taught by us. This is clear also from the passage in Hebrews 13:16, where, for the sake of constructing their 'merit of condignity' they would rather, in line with the ancient translator, explain the verb* *euaresteitai* as 'to earn,' than—as we do—'to be cherished,' even though this latter word expresses the meaning of the apostle better than the former. No-one who is skilled in the Greek language—and also orthodox—would deny it.

It is no less absurd to adduce the word* 'wages' (which occurs very frequently 43
in the sacred writings) in order to lend support to that same merit [of condignity] since the Gospel nowhere promises the salvation of our souls, or eternal life, as wages owed for our good works but as an undeserved and gracious reward. And for that reason it is sometimes called the "goal of faith" (1 Peter 1:9), the "gift of God" (Romans 6:23), and again, "the inheritance that is kept in heaven for us who are co-heirs with Christ by the grace of adoption" (1 Peter 1:4).

---

25 Although the use of 'scribes' for the authors of Scripture is quite common in Reformed theology since Calvin (*Institutes* 4.8.9), the disputations on the doctrine of Scripture in the *SPT* only use it once and particularly for those parts of Scripture that were literally dictated; see *SPT* 3.7. For the use of the Greek word *theopneustos* or "God-breathed" (2 Timothy 3:16) for the inspiration of Scripture see *SPT* 2.13 and 3.6.

26 For the use of the Greek term *autopistos*, "self-convincing" or "self-authenticating" see *SPT* 2.11, 3.18, 8.26. Here it is used to distinguish the canonical Scriptures from the apocrypha. For its use in the *SPT* see Henk van den Belt, *The Authority of Scripture in Reformed Theology: Truth and Trust*, Studies in Reformed Theology 17 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 148–153.

XLIV Ad istam remunerationem Moses oculis fidei respexit, qua Christi nixus probro expiatorio, secundum gratuitam Dei promissionem Abrahamo seminique ipsius factam, majores probri illius arbitratus est divitias, quam Aegyptiorum thesauros, Hebr. 11. 26.

XLV In eandem remunerationem nobis in hoc deserto salebroso peregrinantibus licet intueri, modo eam, non ut stipendium, mercenariorum more, sed ut haereditatem nobis gratuito assignandam, sicuti servos decet pro filiis adoptatos, a Domino ac Patre nostro coelesti exspectemus, dulcique hujus exspectationis solatio aerumnas vitae praesentis diluamus.

XLVI Eadem quidem remuneratio nobis ab Apostolo, 1 Cor. 9, 24. ut τὸ βραβεῖον, seu praemium coronae incorruptae proponitur, ut ejus moti contemplatione stadium nostrum alacrius decurramus, sed quale sit illud βραβεῖον, ostendit Phil. 3, 14. supernae scilicet vocationis Dei, vires nobis in Christo Jesu ad cursum nostrum fortiter ac constanter peragendum suppeditantis. Quae Dei vocatio cum sit gratuita, effectum quoque ac scopum illius, nimirum praemium coronae aeternae, gratuitum esse oportet.

XLVII Nec obstat, quod idem Apostolus coronam illam incorruptam definit coronam justitiae sibi in coelis repositam atque a Christo justo Judice illustris adventus ejus die reddendam, 2 Tim. 4, 8. Non enim coronam illam secundum rigidam operum aestimationem sibi a Christo reddendam esse intelligit, secundum quam se justificatum esse pernegat, 1 Cor. 4, 4. tametsi nullius flagitii sibi esset conscius; sed secundum analogicam* veritatis regulam qualitati* operis cujuslibet, boni aut mali, correspondentem, quod aliis in locis parallelis distincte atque ἀντιθετικῶς, seu ex oppositis, explicatur, ut Rom. 2, 7. 8. *Reddet Deus unicuique secundum opera ipsius. Iis quidem qui sunt perstantes, boni operis gloriam: rixosis vero et veritati non obtemperantibus, sed injustitiae, excan-*

Moses looked forward to that reward with the eyes of faith whereby he 44
relied upon the expiatory reproach that Christ bore, in keeping with God's gracious promise made to Abraham and his seed, and he considered the riches of that reproach of greater value than the treasures of the Egyptians (Hebrews 11:26).

As we journey in the rugged desert of this life we may cast our eyes upon 45
the same reward, so long as we look upon it not as a payment in the way that hirelings do, but as an inheritance that will be assigned to us for free by our Lord and heavenly Father, as befits slaves who have been adopted as sons, and who temper the troubles of this present life by the sweet solace of this expectation.

In 1 Corinthians 9:24 the apostle presents that same reward to us as the prize 46
(*brabeion*) of an imperishable crown, so that, by looking at it we should be driven more eagerly to run our race until the end. And Philippians 3:14 shows what kind of prize it is: it is the prize of the heavenly calling of God who supplies us with the strength in Christ Jesus for the valiant and steadfast completion of our race-course. Since God's calling is free, then its effect and its scope must also be free—that is, the prize of the eternal crown.

And this does not conflict with the fact that the same apostle defines that 47
imperishable crown as the crown of righteousness that has been laid up for him in the heavens and that Christ the righteous Judge will bestow on the day of his glorious coming (2 Timothy 4:8). For Paul does not mean that Christ must give that crown to him following a rigorous appraisal of his works, for he flatly denies that he was justified by that (1 Corinthians 4:4), even though he was not aware of having committed any misdeed. Rather, he means that—according to the analogous* rule of truth—[the crown] corresponds to the quality* of any work whatsoever (good or bad), which in other, parallel passages is explained distinctly and antithetically (or, in comparison with what is opposite to it).[27] This occurs in Romans 2:[6]–8: "God will repay each person according to his works. To those who are persistent: the glory of good work. But for those who are contentious and do not obey the truth but unrighteousness there will be fury

27 In the early Church, 'rule of truth' is synonymous with 'rule of faith' and refers to divine revelation as expressed in Scripture and the creeds. See Jonathan J. Armstrong, "From the κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας to the κανὼν τῶν γραφῶν: The Rule of Faith and the New Testament Canon," in *Tradition & the Rule of Faith in the Early Church: Essays in Honor of Joseph T. Lienhard s.j.*, eds. Ronnie J. Rombs and Alexander Y. Hwang (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2010), 30–47. With the expression 'according to the analogous rule of truth,' Polyander wants to make clear that the final, divine outcome, namely eternal bliss or punishment, is not linked intrinsically to a good or bad work as such. Instead, it is decisive whether one does such works as a believer or an unbeliever.

descentiam, iram, etc. 2 Thess. 1, 6 et 7. *Justum est apud Deum, vicissim reddere iis qui affligunt vos, afflictionem, vobis vero qui premimini, relaxationem nobiscum, quum patefiet Dominus Jesus de coelo*.

XLVIII Neque ex hujusmodi relatione,* tam ad fidelium quam infidelium opera, utraque esse meritoria vere colligitur, quandoquidem Christus infidelium operibus poenam injustitiae secundum legem ex summo jure, fidelium vero operibus coronam justitiae secundum Evangelium ex pacto gratuito retribuet, ut non minus suam justitiam fideli promissae beatitatis praestatione, quam misericordiam, benigna ejus nuntiatione, patefaciat, Hebr. 6, 10. et 10, 23. 1 Joh. 1, 9.

XLIX Patres orthodoxi voces* meriti ac merendi usurpantes,

1. Vocem meriti in utramque partem, pro opere bono, aut malo accipiunt, ut videre est apud Augustinum, *Epist*. 40.[a] ubi malum impiorum meritum a bono piorum merito discernit.
2. Vocem mereri sumunt pro impetrare, vel consequi, ut in gestis Collat. Carthagin. cognitione 3. articul. 258.[b] *Ut omittamus, quantus sanguis Christianus effusus sit per Leontium, Ursatium, Macarium, ceterosque executores quos in Sanctorum necem a Principibus seculi meruerunt*. Et Dominica Prima de adventu Domini,[c] *Excita, quaesumus, Domine, potentiam tuam et veni, ut ab imminentibus peccatorum nostrorum periculis te mereamur protegente eripi, liberante salvari*.
3. Ne quis ex earum vocum* abusu internam dignitatem meritoriam bonis operibus affingat, ea Dei potius commiseratione, quam vitae aeternae compensatione digna esse aliquoties affirmant. Vide August. *In Ps*. 49. et 61.[d] Et Bernard. *Serm*. 67. *Cantic*.[e]

L Quocirca eo graviore censura digni sunt Pontificii, quod non solum ex dictis Sacrae Scripturae, sed etiam Patrum antiquorum prave detortis, dogma suum

---

[a] Augustine, *Ep*. 214.4 (= *Ep*. 40 in old numbering; CSEL 57:384). [b] *Gesta conlationis Carthaginiensis* 3.258 (CCSL 149A:250). [c] *Fasciculus sacrarum orationum et litaniarum ad usum quotidianum christiani hominis, ex sanctis scripturis et patribus collectus* (Munich: Nicolaus Henricus, 1618), 399. [d] Augustine, *Ennarrationes in Psalmos*, 49 (CCSL 38:575–599); 61 (CCSL 39:772–793). [e] Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermo LXVII in Cantica canticorum* (*Sämtliche Werke* 6:188–196).

and wrath, etc." And: "It is just in the eyes of God to repay with affliction those who afflict you, and to give relief, together with us, to you who are being troubled, when the Lord Jesus will be revealed from heaven" (2 Thessalonians 1:6–7).

48 And from this sort of relation* to the works of believers as well as unbelievers it is not right to conclude that the works of either are meritorious, since Christ repays the works of unbelievers with the punishment for unrighteousness by the law of the highest right, but the works of believers with the crown of righteousness according to the Gospel of his covenant of grace, so that he might reveal his righteousness by the trustworthy payment of the promised blessedness no less than his mercy by the favorable declaration of it (Hebrews 6:10 and 10:23; 1 John 1:9).

49 When the orthodox fathers employ the words* 'merit' and 'to earn' 1) they understand the word 'merit' in both ways, as merit for a good work or merit for a bad work. This is seen in *Epistle* 40 of Augustine, where he makes a distinction between the evil merit of the impious and the good merit of the pious. 2) They understand the word 'to earn' as 'to obtain' or 'to acquire,' as in the *Proceedings of the Council of Carthage*, cognition 3, article 258: "let us leave aside how much shedding of Christian blood was done by Leontius, Ursatius, Macarius, and the other executioners whom they *obtained* from the rulers of the world to slaughter the saints."[28] And from the *First Sunday of Advent*: "O Lord, we beseech you to summon forth your power and come, so that by your protection we may *obtain* escape from the dangers that threaten us sinners and salvation by your deliverance."[29] 3) So that no-one should misuse those words* and devise for good works an innate meritorious worthiness, they sometimes state that good works are worthy more of God's sympathy than of a payment of life eternal. See Augustine on Psalm 49 and 61, and Bernard, Sermon 67 on the Song of Songs.

50 For this reason the papal teachers deserve to be judged more severely, because by badly twisting the words not only of sacred Scripture but also those

28 The Council of Carthage (418) was a colloquy of Catholics and Donatists in which Augustine participated. The Council uses the term *mereri* but understands it in the sense of 'to obtain.' The men who are mentioned—the *Proceedings* also name Paulus Taurinus, and Romanus next to them—were imperial officials who persecuted the Donatists. Leontius was *comes* in Africa 317–321 and Ursatius was *dux*; see Maureen A. Tilley, *Donatist Martyr Stories: The Church in Conflict in Roman North Africa* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1996), 53.

29 This is the opening prayer of the liturgy of the First Sunday of Advent in the Roman missal.

de bonorum operum meritis elicere non verecundentur. Nos iis valere jussis, miserationem Dei nostrum esse meritum cum Bernardo ex praecedentibus argumentis concludimus.

of the ancient church fathers, they feel no shame in conjuring up their doctrine of the merits of good works. And as for us, we bid them farewell, and in keeping with the arguments made earlier, we conclude with Bernard that our merit is the compassion of God.

DISPUTATIO XXXV

De Libertate Christiana[a]

Praeside D. ANDREA RIVETO
Respondente JACOBO HENRICO

THESIS I Cum in praecedentibus disputationibus actum sit de redemptione per Christum parta; ejusdemque per fidem salvificam applicatione, omnibus per Christi meritum redemptis ex servitute peccati et mortis; et de sanctificatione justificatorum, eorundemque gratitudine in exercitio bonorum operum: sequitur, ut congruo ordine, instituamus συζήτησιν de vera *Christiana*, seu Evangelica *libertate*, cujus participes fiunt omnes ad quos fructus passionis Christi pertinent.

II Hujus doctrinae necessitatem* talem esse agnoscimus, quae nisi teneatur, nec Christus, nec Evangelii veritas, neque interior pax animae, recte cognosci, aut interno et serio sensu percipi poterit; nec aliquid conscientia sine haesitatione aggredietur; nec justificationis vis sufficienter intelligetur. Est igitur danda opera, ne doctrinae pars adeo necessaria supprimatur; et ita nihilominus explicetur, ut iis qui libertatis nomine* abutuntur, quo in libidinum motus insanos et effrenatam licentiam se proripiant, omnis cavillandi et insolescendi ansa praecidatur.

III Libertatis in genere natura,* ex contrario suo dignosci debet, nempe *Servitute*, quae sonat conditionem quandam subjectionis vilis ac miserae, sive sub-

[a] The original disputation was published as Andreas Rivetus, *Disputationum theologicarum trigesima-quinta, de libertate christiana*, resp. Jacobus Henricus (Leiden: Isaac Elzevir, 1622) and was dated December 3, 1622.

DISPUTATION 35

On Christian Freedom

President: Andreas Rivetus
Respondent: Jacobus Henricus[1]

In the preceding disputations we treated the redemption that is obtained through Christ, and its application by saving faith for all who through Christ's merit have been redeemed from slavery to sin and death; and also the sanctification of those who have been justified and their thankfulness in the exercise of good works. In fitting order, therefore, it follows that we now undertake an investigation into the true Christian, or evangelical, freedom that is shared by all to whom the fruits of Christ's suffering belong.[2] 1

We acknowledge that the need* for having this doctrine is such that if we do not keep it then we will not be able to rightly know Christ, the true Gospel, nor inward peace in our souls, nor to perceive these things with earnest awareness in our hearts.[3] Nor could our conscience undertake anything without hesitation, nor could the power of justification be sufficiently understood. Therefore we must make every effort not to suppress a part of doctrine that is so necessary; and we should also make every effort to explain it so as to cut short any opportunity for criticism or arrogance for those who misuse the name* of freedom in order to hurl themselves into unsound activities of lust and unbridled abandon. 2

In terms of kind, the nature* of freedom should be distinguished from its opposite, namely slavery, which means a certain state of vile and wretched 3

1 Born c. 1601, Jacobus Henricus came from Rochelle (France) and matriculated on June 26, 1621. He defended this disputation on December 3, 1622. See Du Rieu, *Album studiosorum*, 154. Partly because of his common name—probably a Latinization of Jacques Henri—it is difficult to determine more about this French student. He dedicated the disputation to the pastors of Rochelle and to his brother Petrus Henricus (Pierre Henri).

2 The discussion of Christian freedom is determined by the soteriological framework established in the preceding disputations. The satisfaction by Christ and our justification which this satisfaction effects form the grounds of our being freed from slavery. By putting Christian freedom in the context of sanctification, it is excluded that 'freedom' becomes a warrant for individualist lawlessness.

3 A similar statement of the importance of the doctrine of Christian freedom is found in John Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.19.1. The disputation also follows Calvin's phrasing rather closely in theses 32, 34, 37 and 39 below. For a comparison with Calvin see Van den Belt, "Spiritual and Bodily Freedom," 148–165, 157–163.

jectio fuerit voluntaria, sive coacta. Hinc est quod homines distinguuntur in *servos* et *ingenuos*, quorum illi vel jure belli, vel nativitate, vel justa condemnatione, vel emptione in alienam potestatem devenerant, juris constitutione; hi autem qui nati erant liberi, nec unquam servierant (quales se profitebantur Judaei, Joh. 8, 33. *Semen Abrahae sumus, neque cuiquam servivimus unquam, quomodo tu dicis, liberi reddemini?*) Inter istos medii incedebant *liberti*, qui desierant esse servi, et quos Domini ex justa servitute manumiserant.

IV De civili et corporali illa servitute non agitatur a nobis quaestio, ut nec de contraria libertate; ex quibus tamen verba et phrases quasdam desumimus, ad explicandam spiritualem servitutem et libertatem, de qua Dominus, *Si Filius vos liberos reddiderit, vere liberi eritis*, Joh. 8, 36. quae cum in manumissione et liberatione consistat, sequitur neminem nasci liberum, sed fieri, et nullum hominem purum esse spiritualiter *ingenuum*, sed *libertos* esse, quicumque libertate fruuntur.

V Fuit autem servitus spiritualis multiplex, postquam primus homo naturali* sua libertate abusus, eam sibi et posteris amisit; et factus est servus hujus, cui derelicto Deo obedivit, peccati nempe, cui mancipati omnes tenentur, tam secundum reatum condemnationis, quam secundum dominium. Hinc Sata-

subjection, whether that subjection is voluntary or forced. It is hence that men are divided into 'slaves' and 'freemen,' the former of which had come under the power of another person according to the rule of law either by the right of war, by birth, by just sentence of condemnation, or by purchase. But the latter were born free and never had served as slaves.[4] The Jewish people proclaimed themselves to be of this sort: "we are the seed of Abraham and we have never served anyone; how can you say: 'you will be set free'?" (John 8:33). Occupying a middle position between these two were the 'freedmen,' who had ceased to be slaves, and whom their masters had set free from their rightful servitude.

We are not dealing here with the question of that civic and corporal slavery, 4
nor with its opposite, civic and corporal freedom. But we do use some terms and expressions from those realms in order to explain the slavery and freedom that are spiritual. Concerning that spiritual slavery and freedom Christ says: "If the Son shall set you free, you will indeed be free" (John 8:36). Since this spiritual freedom has its origins in manumission and liberation,[5] it follows that no-one is born free but becomes it, and that no-one is spiritually a pure freeman but all people who enjoy that freedom are freedmen.

This manifold spiritual slavery came about after the first man abused his 5
natural* freedom and so lost it for himself and his posterity, and became a slave to what he obeyed by abandoning God, namely sin, to which everyone is kept enslaved by both the guilt of condemnation and by dominion.[6] As

4 The various ways of becoming a slave mentioned in thesis 3 reflect the practices of slavery in Antiquity. Despite differences in legal and social status, the institution of slavery was fairly common in the Ancient Near East, Greece, and Hellenistic culture. The actual practice of slavery was accompanied by philosophical reflection, for example by Plato and Aristotle. Some philosophers argued for a natural difference between slaves and freemen, others advocated the essential equality of all humans. See the article "Sklaverei" in *Der Neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike / Altertum*, ed. Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider (Stuttgart-Weimar: J.B. Metzler, 2001), 11:622–633.

5 On the practice of releasing slaves in Antiquity see the articles "Freigelassene" and "Freilassung" in Cancik and Schneider, *Neue Pauly*, 4:644–650, 653–656 with the (mainly German) literature mentioned there, and J. Albert Harrill, *The Manumission of Slaves in Early Christianity*, Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie 32 (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995). In Roman law, several procedures could be followed to release a person from slavery: by testament as a private act of the owner, by being enlisted in the *census* on the basis of sufficient financial independence, or by a formal verdict issued by the *praetor*. It is arguable that elements from each of these procedures are contained in the metaphorical application of 'manumission' to the idea of Christian freedom. For 'manumission,' cf. the "open hand" of Christ (*liberali manu*) mentioned in thesis 54 below.

6 The earlier disputations 14 "On the Fall of Adam" and 15 "On Original Sin" describe the fall into sin as a voluntary violation of the law of God, which results in bodily and spiritual death

nae potestas et dominatio in filios rebellionis, quae nulla esset nisi a peccato ortum haberet. Hanc servitutem secuta est ejusdem velut declaratio et manifestatio, quae et ipsa servitus dicta est; quando Deus legem moralem pene in animis hominum obliteratam, saltem valde obscuratam, de novo sanciens, rigidam illius exactionem proposuit; ut homo dominantis peccati tyrannidem ex eo cognosceret, quod de praestanda legis conditione illi esset desperandum. Accessit lex ceremonialis, qua merita condemnatio obsignabatur variis typis, quibus homo de reatu convictus, maledictionem extremam exspectaret, nisi liberationis ope redimeretur.[a]

VI Huic peccati servituti per legem contestatae, accedit *Servitus* vanitatis et miseriae, tam in hoc seculo, quam in futuro. Cui multiplici servituti, opponitur triplex libertas, nempe 1. *Naturae*,* sive *innocentiae*, qualis fuit in Adamo. 2. *Gratiae*,* qualem fideles coelestis vocationis participes in hac vita percipiunt. 3. *Gloriae*, qua liberabuntur post hanc vitam ab omni servitute corruptionis et miseriae.

VII Libertati mediae, quae gratiae* libertas est, qua donantur in Christo, qui in se, *metu mortis per omnem vitam obnoxii erant servituti*, Hebr. 2, 15. *Libertatis Christianae* nomen* specialiter attribuimus, eamque describimus, conditionem hominum quos gratia Christi liberavit, qua conscientiae eorum a servitute peccati, tyrannide Diaboli, legis moralis exactione et maledictione, et ceremonialis observatione exemptae, excusso traditionum humanarum jugo, rebus mediis, adhibita fidei cognitione, et caritatis prudentia, extra scandalum indi-

[a] emeretur: original disputation.

as the punishment induced by man's transgression of God's command. See *SPT* 1:338–383. In disputation 17 "On Free Choice," the natural freedom of the will with which humans were created is identified as the internal cause by which the first man and woman lost and ruined this very freedom; see especially *SPT* 17.15–26.

a consequence Satan's sovereignty and domination came over the sons of rebellion,[7] a sovereignty that would not exist if it had not arisen from sin. This slavery was followed (so to speak) by its declaration or manifestation (itself also called slavery) when God renewed the force of the moral law and demanded that it be kept carefully—the law which had been nearly obliterated (or at least mainly hidden) from the hearts of men. God did so in order that man might recognize the tyranny of ruling sin from the fact that he would have to abandon all hope of fulfilling the requirements of that law. The ceremonial law[8] was added to it, and by it the condemnation that man deserved was sealed with various types[9] whereby he, convicted of his guilt, would await the ultimate accursedness unless he should be redeemed by being set free.

The servitude to empty pride and wretchedness in this and the future life 6
was added to this slavery of sin to which the law bore witness. And opposite to this manifold slavery is placed a triple freedom,[10] namely 1) The freedom of our nature,* or innocence, such as Adam had; 2) The freedom of grace,* which believers receive in this life as participants in the heavenly calling; 3) The freedom of glory, whereby they will, after this life, be set free from every [form of] slavery to corruption and wretchedness.[11]

We ascribe the name* 'Christian freedom' especially to that intermediate 7
freedom, which is the freedom of grace* granted in Christ to all "who throughout their whole lives were held in slavery by their fear of death" (Hebrews 2:15). And we describe [that Christian freedom] as the condition of people who have been set free by the grace of Christ, a condition whereby their consciences[12] have been released from slavery to sin, the tyranny of the devil, and from the precise demands and curse of the moral law, and from observing the ceremonial law; and after shaking off the yoke of human traditions, they conduct

---

7 Ephesians 2:2.

8 In *SPT* 18.5 a distinction is made between the moral, ceremonial, and political law. The ceremonial law is explained in *SPT* 18.46. Those precepts of the law that were fulfilled in Christ and only existed "to suit the structure of the Israelite nation" were abolished in order to take away the dividing wall between Jews and gentiles in the New Testament period.

9 As will be explained in theses 20 and 22 below, the ceremonial law of the Old Testament consisted of 'rites' (or forms of observance) such as sacrifices, cleansing, food laws etc. These various institutions are labeled here as 'types' that make visible the guilt of humankind in the eyes of God.

10 See also *SPT* 17.15, 44, where the threefold freedom is stated in similar terms.

11 Cf. the quotation from Bernard of Clairvaux at the end of this disputation.

12 It may be helpful here to consider John Calvin's etymological explanation of 'conscience' as 'knowledge' conjoined with divine justice as a witness (*Institutes* 3.19.15).

scriminatim utuntur; ut qui non acceperunt *spiritum servitutis ad metum*, sed spiritum υἱοθεσίας, Rom. 8, 15. sponte et alacriter tam animo quam corpore Deo serviant, *ad laudem gloriosae ipsius gratiae*, suamque sempiternam salutem.

VIII Hujus libertatis causa* efficiens princeps est Deus Pater, *qui idoneos nos fecit ad participationem sortis Sanctorum in lumine*, Col. 1, 12. Filius mediator Dei et hominum qui *nos liberavit*, Gal. 5, 1. et Spiritus Sanctus utriusque συνεργὸς, qui ubicunque habitat, libertatem secum affert, 2 Cor. 3, 17. Causa* προηγουμένη est gratia* et φιλανθρωπία Dei in Christo, Luc. 1, 72. et 74. προκαταρκτικὴ, est Christi meritum et satisfactio, in quo habemus ἐλευθέρωσιν ἀπο τῆς ἁμαρτίας, Rom. 6, 22. et ἀπολύτρωσιν ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαραδότου, 1 Pet. 1, 18. *quae non facta est argento vel auro, sed pretioso ejus sanguine*, quo omnis operis humani meritum excluditur.

IX Efficiens instrumentalis duplex est: Ex parte Dei, veritas Evangelica, qua libertas offertur per praedicationem, Jerem. 34, 15. et cui liberatio attribuitur, Joh. 8, 32. Ideo Evangelii praedicatio, *ministerium reconciliationis* appellatur, 2 Cor. 5, 19. lnstrumentum autem homini necessarium et per spiritum et verbum ingeneratum, est fides viva, qua *adducti sumus in hanc gratiam in qua stamus*, Rom. 5, 2.

X Materia in qua, sive subjectum,* est omnis credens in Christum, et ad eum tamquam liberatorem confugiens, sive Graecus, sive Judaeus, sive mas, sive femina, etc. id est cujusvis sexus, conditionis, nationis, etc. in Ecclesia Novi Testamenti. Nam ad ejus membra pertinet proprie* *libertas Christiana* per omnes suos gradus, quorum (si omnes intelligantur) nemo ante Christum exhibitum, particeps fieri potuit.* Si tamen gradus primos et praecipuos spectemus ad salutem omnino necessarios, et substantiam* libertatis in se, eam fidelibus sub Veteri Testamento non negamus fuisse communicatam, etsi non ad eam mensuram qua Christo manifestato apparuit; quae etiam suo modo* *Christiana* dici potuit, nam qui tunc τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ portarunt Hebr. 11,

'intermediate things'[13] safely without reproach by applying knowledge of faith and practical judgment of love, so that they who have not received "a spirit of slavery unto fear" but a spirit of sonship (Romans 8:15) may serve God willingly and eagerly in soul and in body, "for the praise of his glorious grace" [Ephesians 1:6] and their own eternal salvation.

The chief efficient cause* of this freedom is God the Father "who has made us to share in the inheritance of the saints in light" (Colossians 1:12). It is also the Son, the Mediator between God and man "who has set us free" (Galatians 5:1); and the Holy Spirit, 'fellow-worker' with the Father and the Son, who brings freedom with him wherever he dwells (2 Corinthians 3:17). The principal impelling cause* is God's grace* and love for mankind in Christ (Luke 1:72 and 74). The initiating cause* is the merit and satisfaction of Christ in whom we have "freedom from sin" (Romans 6:22) and a "ransom from the empty way of life inherited from our fathers," a ransom "which was not made with silver or gold but with his precious blood" (1 Peter 1:18[–19]), which excludes the merit of any human work. 8

There are two aspects to the efficient instrumental cause: from the side of God it is the true Gospel whereby freedom is offered through the preaching (Jeremiah 34:15), and John 8:32 ascribes liberation to it. Accordingly the preaching of the Gospel is called "the ministry of reconciliation" (2 Corinthians 5:[18–]19). For man, however, the necessary instrument, which is ingenerated by the Spirit and the Word, is a living faith, "whereby we have access into this grace in which we stand" (Romans 5:2). 9

The matter in which, or the subject* [of Christian freedom], is everyone who believes in Christ and who takes refuge in him as his liberator, whether Greek or Jew, male or female, etc. (that is, of whichever gender, state, nation, etc.) in the church of the New Testament. For it is to the members of the church that 'Christian freedom' in all of its degrees properly* belongs. And if all of the degrees are to be grasped fully, then before Christ was revealed no-one could* be a member. But if we consider the primary, foremost degrees, the ones that are altogether necessary for salvation, and the very substance* of freedom, then we do not deny that freedom had been communicated to believers under the Old Testament, albeit not to the extent that was revealed with Christ's appearance. And that freedom in its own way* could even be called 'Christian' freedom, for those who were at that time bearing "the reproach of Christ" (Hebrews 10

13 The expression 'intermediate things' refers to the term *adiaphora* which appears later in this disputation (thesis 16 and 32–40 below) to denote those things that are neither good nor evil within themselves, but are only good or evil with respect to their use. Those things are morally neutral concerning the moral law see also note 32 below.

26. Christum etiam libertatis spiritualis auctorem agnoverunt, cujus quia nobiscum fuerunt participes, non male *communis** a quibusdam vocata est, ut ab ea distinguatur quae ad plenitudinem gratiae* pertinens, specialiter Christiana libertas appellatur.

XI Utriusque, tam communis* illius et minus perfectae, quam perfectioris hujus, *Materia* circa quam, sive objectum, multiplex est, et ex ejus varietate diversi etiam gradus, aut (ut alii vocare malunt) partes, hujus libertatis statuuntur, 1. enim ea pro objecto habet peccatum, ejusdemque reatum, dominium, et ex eo, Diaboli tyrannidem. Acquiritur gradus ille libertatis a primaria illa servitute, per remissionem peccati cum non imputatur, et per mortificationem carnis cum non amplius dominatur. Item per immunitatem a morte secunda, cum *lex spiritus vitae per Christum Jesum liberos nos reddit a lege peccati et mortis*, Rom. 8, 2. Atque ita *nulla est condemnatio iis qui sunt in Christo Jesu*, ibid. v. 1.

XII Huic libertati non obstat, quod peccatum adhuc in credentibus habitet et remaneat actu, 1Joh. 1, 8. quia tollitur reatu, et ejus vires imminuuntur, ut regnum ei auferatur, Rom. 6, 12. Nam per Spiritus Sancti donationem liberantur piorum conscientiae a peccato, eatenus, ut non sint amplius ejus mancipia, sed milites et servi justitiae, Rom. 6, 14. et 7, 22. Nondum igitur sublata est pugna, sufficit si adempta sit hosti victoria. Qua de re* quia in doctrina de Resipiscentia et Justificatione actum est, non est, quod pluribus eam persequamur.

11:26) realized that Christ was the author of spiritual freedom too; and because they were participants in it with us, some not inappropriately have called this freedom 'shared'* in order to distinguish it from the freedom that concerns the fullness of grace,* which is called Christian freedom in particular.[14]

The matter concerning which, or the object of the two freedoms (the one 11
that is shared* and less complete, and this more complete one), is manifold, and from its variety also diverse degrees (or parts, as others prefer to call them) have been arranged. For 1) it has sin as its object, and the guilt thereof, that is, the dominion of the devil and so his tyranny. [All believers] acquire that degree of freedom from the primary slavery, since through the remission of sin it is not imputed to them, and through the mortification of the flesh it no longer reigns over them. And they acquire it also through the immunity from the second death, because "the law of the Spirit of life through Jesus Christ has set us free from the law of sin and death" (Romans 8:2), and so "there is no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus" (Romans 8:1).

The fact that sin still dwells in those who believe and remains active in 12
them (1John 1:8) is not a hindrance to this freedom because the guilt for it has been removed and its powers have been diminished, in order to do away with its kingdom (Romans 6:12). For through the granting of the Holy Spirit the consciences of the pious are set free from sin to the extent that they are no longer slaves to it, but they are soldiers and servants of righteousness (Romans 6:14 [, 18] and 7:22). Therefore, though the war is not yet over, it is enough that the victory has been obtained from the enemy. And since we have dealt with this matter* in the doctrines of repentance and justification, we do not need to pursue it further.[15]

---

14 In the following theses Rivetus distinguishes between the freedom in which believers before and after the coming of Christ share, and the more complete freedom after the coming of Christ. All believers share in the freedom from sin and guilt (theses 11–12), from the demand of fulfilling the moral law (theses 13–16), and from human traditions, that bind the consciences of believers (theses 17–19). These three degrees correspond to the three parts of Christian freedom distinguished by Calvin (*Institutes* 3.19.2–7). For the believers in the revealed Christ (as opposed to Christ yet to come) the nature of the new freedom is developed in theses 20–23: they are no longer obligated to the ceremonial law, and to those laws that contain certain ceremonial elements (thesis 28). Rivetus adds to these the freedom from the forensic law (thesis 29) and political law (thesis 30) and laws that are a mixture of the political and the moral law (thesis 31). This fundamental freedom toward the Mosaic Law in all its specifications is followed by a discussion of the *adiaphora* (theses 32–40).

15 See *SPT* 32.14–17.

XIII 2. Versatur eadem libertas circa legem moralem, quatenus *per illam affectus peccatorum vigent in membris ad fructificandum morti*, Rom. 7, 5. cum nempe homini peccatori nullam spem salutis proponit, quam in exactissima mandatorum observantia, *Hoc fac, et vives*, Luc. 10, 28. quae durissima exactio totius legis implendae, cum ejusdem legis maledictione, si a nobis non perfecte observaretur, fuit conjuncta, Deut. 27, 26. Gal. 3, 10. Jugum hoc gravissimum fuit et ἀφέρτατον, quod confregit Christus, facta translatione utriusque obligationis, tam execrationis ob non impletam legem, quam impletionis requisitae, in personam* suam; in qua perfecte legem implevit, et factus est pro nobis execratio, Gal. 3. 13. *Et Deus misso Filio de peccato damnavit peccatum, ut justitia legis impleretur in nobis*, Rom. 8, 3. 4.

XIV Non idcirco legem supervacuam esse docemus, quin potius doctrinam ejus immotam et obedientiam esse necessariam omnibus, statuimus, et eam demum veram libertatem agnoscimus, cum Deo secundum praescriptum legis ejus servimus. Propterea, in Scriptura liberum esse et Deo servire, verbis* differunt quidem, sed reipsa idem sunt, 1Pet. 2, 16. Et Paulus Rom. 6, 18. libertatem Christianam in *servitute justitiae* constituit. Est igitur pars libertatis, quod Spiritu Sancto donati, efficit in nobis, ut legem, etsi non omni, magna tamen ex parte, impleamus; et quod per carnis infirmitatem, vel omittimus, vel contra eam committimus, perfecta legis impletione, quae solius est Christi, nobis imputata, vel pro non omisso, vel pro non commisso habeatur.

XV Etsi ergo liberi sint a lege renati, quatenus vel per eam quaeritur justificatio, vel quatenus condemnat: suos nihilominus apud eos usus habet, cum docet quae sint bona opera in quibus ambulare debeant, eosque dirigit ut intra metas recti itineris retineantur, dum carnis vetustatem reliquam in eis arguit, imperfectionem inchoatae in eis obedientiae accusat, et humilitatis argumenta suggerit, ne ad justitiae propriae persuasionem ferantur.

2. The same freedom has a function concerning the moral law, insofar as 13
"by it the feelings of sin are at work in our members to bring forth fruits unto death" (Romans 7:5), since it presents no hope at all of salvation for the sinful man other than in a very precise observance of the commandment "do this and live" (Luke 10:28). This very harsh requirement of fulfilling the entire law was linked to the same law's curse if we did not keep it perfectly (Deuteronomy 27:26; Galatians 3:10). This yoke was very heavy and unbearable, and Christ broke it, having transferred both obligations to his own person:* the curse that came for not fulfilling the law as well as the requirement of fulfilling it. And by the transference he both fulfilled the law perfectly and was made a curse for us (Galatians 3:13). "And by sending his Son God condemned sin in the flesh so that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us" (Romans 8:3–4).

Accordingly we teach that the law is not superfluous, but we rather state 14
that what it teaches remains unaffected, and that all should obey it; and we know what freedom really is only when we serve God according to the prescript of his law. Therefore in Scripture 'to be free' and 'to serve God' are in fact the same thing, although they are worded* differently (1 Peter 2:16). And Paul, in Romans 6:18, locates Christian freedom in the 'servitude to righteousness.' Therefore part of the freedom is the fact that in us it is brought about that we, gifted with the Holy Spirit, fulfill the law for a large part, although not in its entirety. And because through the weakness of our flesh we either omit [to keep it], or on the other hand commit [sin against it] it is not considered as an omission or a commission,[16] because the perfect fulfillment of the law—which is in Christ alone—has been imputed to us.

Therefore even if those who have been born again are free from the law 15
insofar as it is a means for obtaining justification by it, or insofar as it condemns, [the law] is nonetheless of use to them since it teaches what those good works are wherein they ought to walk. And it guides them to stay within the boundaries of the right way, while it denounces the old remains of the flesh,

16 For an explanation of the 'sins of commission' and 'sins of omission' as the two parts of 'mortal sin,' see Altenstaig, *Lexicon*, s.v. "peccatum omissionis." Altenstaig quotes Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventura, Gabriel Biel, and Jean Gerson among others. The sin of commission is a 'positive' transgression of a 'negative' commandment, such as "Do not steal, do not commit adultery." In the sin of omission, a further twofold distinction can be made: in the first case, a person does not 'omit' a sinful act he should refrain from (for example: stealing, committing adultery); in the second case, an act that is positively commanded by God is omitted (for example: loving God with all our heart). See also the earlier discussion in *SPT* 16 10–11.

XVI Ut ergo furores Antinomorum rejicimus, qui legem moralem ex Ecclesia proscribendam et eliminandam censent (sine cujus doctrinae, in ea, illibata conservatione, vel articulo de justificatione, vel[a] doctrinae de bonis operibus, aut de originali peccato, vel de libero arbitrio,* suam constare posse* puritatem et integritatem negamus[b]) sic jure de atroci Bellarmini calumnia conquerimur, qua nos libertatem Christianam in eo constituere, mentitur, quod homo justificatus fide, nulli legi subjaceat in conscientia, sed liber a debito legis implendae, omnia pro indifferentibus habeat, neque praeceptis, neque prohibitis, lib. 4. *De Justif*. cap. 1. et 5.[c]

XVII 3. Libertatis omnium fidelium communis* haec etiam pars fuit, et erit usque ad consummationem seculi, quod in rebus* ad cultum Dei pertinentibus, et circa quas actus* religionis,* quos elicitos vocant, versantur, ab omni traditionum humanarum jugo liberas habeant conscientias; cum solius Dei sit, res ad religionem* pertinentes, praescribere, ac proinde in solum ejus verbum, quod ad cultum attinet, non ad humanas traditiones sit attendendum. Nemini enim Deus concessit auctoritatem vel αὐτοκρατορικὴν vel νομοθετικὴν in hominum conscientias, ubi de cultu agitur, in quo Deus solus immediate* conscientiam devincit, qui *unus est legislator, qui potest servare et perdere*, Jac. 4, 12.

---

[a] nec articulo de justificatione, nec: original disputation. [b] afferimus, nec: original disputation. [c] Bellarmine, *De iustificatione* 4.1, 5 (*Opera* 6:294a–296b, 306b–310b).

chides them for the imperfection of the obedience that was begun in them, and provides convincing reasons for being humble, so they are not swept along to a persuasion of their own righteousness.

Therefore just as we reject the ravings of the Antinomians,[17] who are of 16
the opinion that the moral law ought to be proscribed and eliminated from the Church (we say that if the teaching [of the moral law] is not preserved undiminished in the Church, then its purity and integrity cannot* stand firm, nor the articles about justification, the doctrine of good works, original sin, or free choice*), so too do we have the right to complain about Bellarmine's dreadful slandering, which falsely alleges that we situate Christian freedom in the fact that the man who has been justified by faith is in his conscience not subject to any law at all, but is free from the requirement to fulfill the law and he considers everything as indifferent, as neither prescribed nor prohibited (Book 4 *On Justification*, chapter 1 and 5).

3. It has also been a part of the freedom common* to all believers, and it will 17
be so until the end of the age, that they have consciences that are free of every yoke of human traditions in matters* pertaining to the worship* of God and in matters which involve religious actions (which are called 'elicited acts'[18]). For it belongs only to God to prescribe matters that pertain to religion,* and it is for this reason that in matters of worship we should pay attention only to his Word and not to human traditions. For to no-one has God granted authority (whether it be autocratic or legally bestowed authority) over the consciences of other people, when it concerns worship in which God alone binds the conscience in a non-mediated* way, as He "alone is the lawgiver who is able to save and to destroy" (James 4:12).

---

17 It is not clear to whom Rivetus is referring. Soon after the Reformation Martin Luther sought to refute Johannes Agricola (1494–1566) who held that Christians are free from the Mosaic Law. Luther wrote *Contra Antinomos* (*WA* 39/1:359–584) in 1539, thus coining the name Antinomianism for the rejection of the lasting importance of the moral law. See Joachim Rogge, *Johann Agricolas Lutherverständnis unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Antinomismus* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlaganstalt, 1960). The discussions on Antinomianism within the Reformed camp in England and New England started only in the 1630s. In his discussion of the Decalogue, Antonius Walaeus identifies some of the Anabaptists as *antinomi*. Walaeus, *Opera* 1:95b.

18 The term 'elicited acts' invokes the distinction between actus *imperatus* and actus *elicitus*. Next to outward religious acts (*cultus*) there are also religious acts of the mind, like prayer, which are called 'elicited acts' here, because they are immanent actions of the will, consisting merely in its inclination towards a possibility. For an explanation in connection with Girolamo Zanchi's discussion of free choice see *RTF*, 84; cf. also Altenstaig, *Lexicon*, s.v. "actus exterior / interior."

XVIII Quando autem de regimine proprie* spirituali loquimur, quod totum Deo uni vendicamus (cum ad regnum spirituale pertineat, in quo Deus vicarium non admittit) nolumus quae de spirituali libertate dicimus perperam ad politicum ordinem trahi, ac si Christiani qui secundum spiritum liberi sunt, eximerentur propterea omni carnis servitute. Rejicimus enim fanaticos, qui praetextu libertatis Christianae, obedientiam omnem civilem excutiunt, cum per Paulum Deus ut obediamus magistratui praecipiat, *non poenae solum metu, sed propter conscientiam*, Rom. 13, 1. et 5.

XIX Nec tamen ideo sequitur, politicis legibus, quae proprie* humanae sunt, nec inter Dei leges habentur, *directe* et *immediate** obstringi conscientias, quod Pontificii contendunt, quia proprie* et per se id conscientiam immediate* obligat, quod propter Dei mandatum facere necesse est, etsi nullius creaturae mandatum aut respectus accederet. Talis non est materia propria legum humanarum, quas tamen concedimus *obligare conscientias* mediate,* vi generalis mandati divini, quo praecipitur obedientia erga magistratum. Cum autem humana lex *primo* et *per se* non obliget, sed *secundario et per accidens*,* falsum est dogma a Bellarmino propugnatum, lib. 3. *De memb. Eccl. milit*. c. 11.[a] *Legem civilem non minus ligare in conscientia quam legem divinam, et omnem legem, a quocunque feratur, sive a Deo, sive ab Angelo, sive ab homine, eodem mode* obligare*.

XX Hactenus de gradibus et partibus libertatis filiorum Dei, omnibus fidelibus, omni tempore, quatenus vel in Christum venturum crediderunt, vel in Christum exhibitum credunt, communibus,* etsi secundum plus vel minus communicatis. Ad libertatem propriam temporibus Novi Testamenti pertinet vindicatio a servitute oeconomica* legis ceremonialis, quae multiplex est, secundum varios ejusdem legis respectus. Primo enim hoc habuit, quod fuit signaculum

[a] Bellarmine, *De membris Ecclesiae* 3.11 (*Opera* 3:17b–20b; quotations from 17b and 18a).

But since we are speaking about the strictly* spiritual government, which we 18
claim belongs entirely to God alone (since it pertains to the spiritual kingdom in which God does not allow a vice-regent), we do not want what we say about spiritual freedom to be wrongly drawn into the realm of politics, as if Christians who are free according to the spirit are therefore exempt from every kind of service to the flesh. For we reject the fanatics who under the pretext of Christian freedom cast off every form of civil obedience,[19] because God through Paul teaches us to obey the magistrate, "not only from fear of punishment, but for the sake of conscience" (Romans 13:1 and 5).

However, it does not therefore follow that the consciences are bound in a 19
direct, non-mediated* way by political laws that are strictly* human laws and not found among the laws of God (which the papal teachers contend), because it is what we must do by God's command that strictly* and of itself binds the consciences non-mediatedly,* although no command or consideration of any creature is added to it. The subject-matter proper to human laws is not of that sort—human laws which we nevertheless admit do bind the consciences in a mediated way,* by force of God's general command, which bids obedience towards the magistrate. For since human laws are not binding in principle and of themselves, but secondarily and through accident,* the teaching that Bellarmine defends is false, that "the civil law is no less binding than the divine law, and that all laws that have been made by any one at all (whether God, an angel, or a human being) are binding in the same manner"* (*On the Members of the Church Militant*, book 3, chapter 2).

So much for now about the degrees and elements of the freedom of God's 20
children that all believers in every age share* (whether they believed in Christ yet to come or now believe in Christ as having been revealed), although these stages and elements have been communicated to a greater or lesser extent. Particular to the freedom that befits the times of the New Testament is the release from the dispensationary* slavery to the ceremonial law, and in keeping with the law's diverse aspects it has many facets.[20] For in the first place, the law

19 It was common for the Reformed to accuse the Anabaptists of rejection of civil authority. For example, in John Calvin's treatise "Brief Instruction for Arming All the Good Faithful Against the Errors of the Common Sect of the Anabaptists," the sixth article of the Schleitheim Confession of 1527 is targeted as a representative statement of the Anabaptist attitude toward government and society; see John Calvin, *Treatises Against the Anabaptists and Against the Libertines; Translation, Introduction, and Notes*, Benjamin Wirt Farley (ed.) (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1982), 76–91. On early Swiss and South German Anabaptism see also Williams, *Radical Reformation*, 288–313; on the spread of Anabaptism in the Netherlands, with specific attention for Libertines or Spiritualists, ibid., 524–539.

20 An earlier discussion of the 'ceremonial law' is found in disputation 18 "Concerning the

condemnationis peccatoris, et debiti nostri chirographum, Gal. 3, 21. impositum *usque ad tempus correctionis*, Ebr. 9, 10., quod tempus impletum fuit *Christo delente quod adversus nos erat, rituum chirographum, et illud e medio auferente*, Coloss. 2, 14. Nam per ipsum sublata condemnatione, non debuit manere condemnationis signaculum.

XXI Praeterea, cum ceremonialia praecepta specialiter spectaverint ad cultum Israëlitico populo convenientem, secundum significationem mysteriorum Christi venturi, Coloss. 1, 27. Ebr. 8, 4. et 10, 1. qua de causa jussus fuerat Moses facere omnia *juxta similitudinem et exemplar in monte ostensum*, Exod. 25, 40. veniente corpore, cessavit umbra, accedente prototypo, cessit typus, nec jam potest* mysterium redemptionis, aut verbo,* aut opere significari* vere tamquam futurum; perinde enim esset mendacium in significatione operis, ac si quis jam verbis diceret, Christus est venturus et moriturus, etc.

XXII Si vero eosdem ritus spectemus, quatenus Ecclesia Judaeorum in infantili aetate quae tutore opus habuit et paedagogo, sub elementis mundi in spe venturi Messiae custodita est, ut in fidem illius et ad illum deduceretur, idem Apostolus qui hunc legis ceremonialis usum edocuit, simul ostendit, *in plenitudine temporis, missum fuisse Filium, etc. ut eos qui legi obnoxii erant, redimeret*, Gal. 4, 1. et seqq. *Itaque jam non esse servos, sed filios et haeredes per Christum*, v. 7.

XXIII Denique, si usum alium legis ceremonialis consideremus, quod ejus ritus fuerunt notae professionis, signa et distinctiones populi Israëlitici et politiae ejus Ecclesiasticae ab omnibus aliis gentibus, qua ratione velut septo ac maceria distincti fuerunt Israëlitae ab idololatricis aliarum gentium cultibus, Gen. 17, 13. 14. Deut. 4, 8. Eph. 2, 14. tali respectui nullus amplius reliquus est locus, postquam *gentes quae olim erant longinquae, propinquae factae sunt per sanguinem Christi, qui est pax nostra, qui fecit ex utraque unum, et intergerivi parietis septum solvit*, etc. Eph. 2, 13. et seqq.

XXIV Jure igitur damnati sunt olim veteres haeretici, qui hanc legem existimarunt non cessavisse, sed cum Evangelio perpetuo servandam esse, Cerinthus nempe, teste Epiphan. *Haeres*. 28.[a] et August. *Haeres*. 8.[b] Et Ebion, teste Irenaeo, lib. 1.

[a] Epiphanius, *Panarion* or *Adversus haereses* 28 (GCS 25:313–321). [b] Augustine, *De haeresibus* 8 (CCSL 46:294).

Law of God," theses 46–48. Johannes Polyander there listed six 'uses' of the ceremonial law, most of which Rivetus mentions in this thesis and the subsequent theses.

consisted of the fact that it was a sign of the sinner's verdict and a written record of our indebtedness (Galatians 3:21), laid upon us "until the time of restoration" (Hebrews 9:10), the time that was fulfilled when "Christ blotted out the written record of ordinances against us and took it away" (Colossians 2:14). For when the verdict was taken away by him, it was no longer necessary that the sign of our verdict stay.

21 Moreover, since the ceremonial precepts are concerned especially with the worship appropriate to the Israelite nation for an outward sign of the mysteries of the coming Christ (Colossians 1:27; Hebrews 8:4 and 10:1)—for which reason Moses had been ordered to make everything "according to the likeness and pattern shown on the mountain" (Exodus 25:40)—when he did come in the body, the shadow disappeared,[21] and when the prototype came, the type yielded its place, and it now is no longer possible* for the mystery of redemption to be truly signified* as something yet to come either in word* or in deed, for in the outward sign of the deed there would be the same lie as if someone were to say "Christ is still going to come and to die, etc."

22 Indeed, if we take a look at the same rites, because the church of the Jewish people in the time of its infancy (which needed a tutor and pedagogue) was kept in custody under the elements of the universe[22] in hope of the coming Messiah, so that it might be led to believe in him and be led to him, [we see that] the same Apostle who taught this use of the ceremonial law also pointed out that "in the fullness of time his Son was sent forth, etc., to redeem those who were under the law" (Galatians 4:1 and following), "so that you are no longer slaves, but sons and heirs through Christ" (Galatians 4:7).

23 And lastly, if we consider the other use of the ceremonial law, namely that its rites were the marks of what it professed, the signs and tokens that set the Israelite people and its ecclesiastical form of government apart from all the other peoples, which like an enclosure or a dividing wall distinguished the Israelite nation from the idolatrous forms of worship of the other peoples (Genesis 17:13 and 14; Deuteronomy 4:8; Ephesians 2:14), there was no longer any place for this aspect of the law after "the people who once were far off were brought near by the blood of Christ, who is our peace, who has made both one, and has broken down the middle wall of partition" (Ephesians 2:13 and following).

24 Therefore in former times the ancient heretics were rightly condemned who thought that this law has not ceased but ought to be preserved in perpetuity along with the Gospel: Cerinthus (as witnessed in Epiphanius *Against Heresies*

21 For this language of 'shadow' and 'body,' see also *SPT* 18.46 and 23.17.

22 Galatians 4:3.

cap. 28.[a] ut et Ebionaei, et qui Nazaraei dicti fuerunt, apud Epiphan. *Haeres*. 18.[b] et August. *Haeres*. 9.[c] quibus non favet quod post resurrectionem Christi, Paulus circumcidit Timotheum, Act. 16, 3. et ex consilio Jacobi, ipse cum aliis, se Judaica ceremonia purificavit, Act. 21. vers. 26. qua in re nihil praejudicavit Christianae libertati, cujus alibi contra imprudens Petri factum, se assertorem strenuum declaravit, Gal. 2, 14.

XXV Hic ergo est adhibenda distinctio, quam ab Augustino Schola Theologica mutuata est, potuisse* nempe post Christum, ad usque sufficientem evulgationem Evangelii inter Judaeos, ceremonialia observari, non quidem tamquam Christum venturum praesignificantia, aut ex opinione necessitatis* ad salutem; sed ut mandata a bono auctore profecta, per passionem Christi mortua quidem et evacuata, cum aliquo tamen honore sepelienda et ad sepulcrum deferenda. Post illud autem tempus non amplius id licuisse nec jam licere, nisi quis haberi velit *sepulcri violator*. Tunc quidem fuisse mortua, sed eo quo diximus sensu, et ut duo populi coalescerent, nondum *mortifera*. Postea vero et mortua et mortifera.

XXVI Nec est quod quis excipiat, se auferre significationem, neque inducere necessitatem,* et inde (quod fecit[d] Cajetanus[e]) Aethiopum superstitionem excuset,

[a] Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* 1.26 (SC 264:344). [b] Epiphanius, *Panarion* or *Adversus haereses* 18 (GCS 25:215–217). [c] Augustine, *De haeresibus* 9 (CCSL 46:294–295). [d] existimavit: original disputation. [e] Tommaso de Vio Cajetan, *Commentaria in Summa St. Thomae et quodlibetales questiones* (Antwerp: Thomas Lyndam, 1574), 186a in margine.

28 and Augustine *Against Heresies* 8), Ebion (as witnessed by Irenaeus book 1 chapter 28) along with the Ebionites and those who were called the Nazarenes (in Epiphanius *Against Heresies* 18 and Augustine *Heretics* 9).[23] The fact that after Christ's resurrection Paul circumcised Timothy (Acts 16:3) does not help their view, nor the fact that on the advice of James he, together with others, purified himself according to Jewish ceremony (Acts 21:26)—an affair wherein Paul showed no prejudice against Christian freedom, as he showed himself to be a forceful defender of it elsewhere, over against the unwise behavior of Peter (Galatians 2:14).

At this point we must therefore apply the distinction that the 'School of 25
Theology' derived from Augustine, namely that after Christ the ceremonial things could* have been observed until such time as the Gospel was sufficiently spread among the Jews—not, of course, as outward signs that foretold that Christ was yet to come, or from the notion that it was necessary* for salvation, but as commands proceeding from a good source that by Christ's suffering were put to death and emptied of meaning, but which are to be carried to their graves and buried with due respect. But after that time it was no longer permitted to observe them, nor should anyone observe them now unless he wishes to be seen as a 'violator of the tomb.' But at that time they were dead indeed, but only in the sense that we stated, although they were not yet deadly, so that the two nations might grow together. (But later they would be both dead and deadly.)[24]

Nor should anyone state that he is removing the signification and aban- 26
doning all necessity,* and so (as Cajetan does) excuse the superstition of the

23 The work of Cerinthus (c. AD 100) is only known through the early church fathers. Cerinthus was probably born a Jew in Egypt. Little is known of his life, save that he was a teacher and founded a short-lived sect of Jewish Christians with Gnostic tendencies. He denied the divinity of Christ, and commended the practice of circumcision and the observance of the Sabbath. Cerinthus is mentioned by Epiphanius of Constantia (310/320–403), who was bishop of Salamis and a strong defender of orthodoxy. The book here referred to as *Against Heresies* is also known as *Panarion* ('Medicine Chest'). According to Tertullian, Cerinthus was followed by Ebion. In fact, the Palestinian sect of the Ebionites is most probably not named after the (unknown) founder Ebion, but after the Hebrew word *ebionim* ('the poor'). The Ebionite movement may have arisen about the time of the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem (AD 70), and seems to have existed into the 4th century. They believed that Jesus was the Messiah, although they rejected his divinity. In their view, Jesus became Messiah because he obeyed the Jewish Law. They themselves faithfully followed the Law.

24 See *SPT* 18.47 (with footnote) and 21.50 for the expressions "buried with due respect" and "both dead and deadly" and 38.32 for an example of an aspect of the ceremonial that had not yet been abolished entirely in the apostolic age.

qui ad imitationem Christi, non ad significationem, circumcisionem observant. Id enim illicitum esse, etiam alii ex eadem schola recte sentiunt, non solum propter scandalum, sed etiam quia cultus ille, non tantum propter significationem Christi futuri, sed etiam propter modum, repugnat veritati et perfectioni* Evangelii, per quem voluit Christus cultum illum antiquare; non tantum quia futurorum erat significativus, *sed quia ad modum colendi Deum umbratilem et imperfectum pertinebat*. Ad quam normam si examinentur pleraeque Pontificiorum ceremoniae, non minus erunt hoc tempore mortiferae, eoque magis quod ab hominibus ad cultum et ex opinione necessitatis sunt invectae.

XXVII Quamvis autem Christiani a legibus ceremonialibus sint liberi, illarum tamen cognitionis usum non exiguum esse fatemur. Nam ut vaticinia Prophetarum de adventu Christi licet impleta sint, magno cum fructu in Ecclesia leguntur: sic Leviticae ceremoniae non minus utiliter investigantur et explicantur, ut quomodo Christus in illis cum omnibus suis beneficiis praefiguratus fuerit, intelligentes, inde hauriamus confirmationem fidei nostrae. Huc pertinet dictum Christi ad Judaeos, Joh. 5, 46. *Si Mosi crederetis, crederetis etiam mihi, de me enim ille scripsit*, nempe non tantum expressis vaticiniorum verbis, sed etiam praescriptis ceremoniarum ritibus et Christum adumbrantibus typis.[a] Sic ex

[a] ceremoniarum Christum adumbrantum typis: original disputation.

Ethiopians who maintain circumcision for the sake of imitating Christ, and not for what it signifies.[25] For even other people of that same school rightly sense that this cannot be right, not only because of the stumbling block[26] but also because that religious observance (both as an outward sign of the coming Christ and as a means) flies in the face of the truth and perfection* of the Gospel whereby it was Christ's will that this religious practice should be made obsolete.[27] Not only because it functioned as an outward sign of the things that were to come, but also because it belonged to the manner of worshiping God that was but a shadow and not perfect. If one were to examine the majority of the papal ceremonies by this standard, they would be no less deadly at this (current) time, and all the more so because they were brought in by men for worship and from the notion that they are necessary.

Yet we do grant that there is great value in knowing the ceremonial laws, even 27
though Christians are free from them. For just as the things that the prophets foretold about the coming of Christ may have been fulfilled, yet are read in the church with great benefit, so too the Levitical ceremonies are examined and explained no less usefully, so that from an understanding of how Christ and all his benefits had been prefigured in them we derive the strengthening of our faith. What Christ said to the Jews in John 5:46 is relevant here: "If you believed Moses you would believe me, for he wrote about me." By this he meant not just the explicit words of the prophecies but also the ceremonial rites and figures that foreshadowed Christ. In this manner it is from the rite of sacrifices for sin

25 The reference here is probably to Cajetan's commentary on Thomas Aquinas, *Summa sacrae theologiae* 3.37.1 sub iv (Leonine edition 11:376): "And although it is not according to the church's common custom, still it is according to the age-old custom of those churches in India under the reign of David (commonly called Prestis Johannes), which the universal Roman church apparently never condemned. Therefore, although circumcision is superstitious elsewhere, in places where it is a matter of custom it is not."

26 For the notion of 'stumbling block' (*skandalon*), derived from Romans 14:13, see thesis 36 below, and cf. the inclusion of this element in the initial description of Christian freedom in thesis 7 above.

27 In this thesis, Rivetus rejects the opinion of people who maintain a certain religious custom (such as circumcision), but claim that they do so without any necessity and without the original signification. Rivetus argues that, while such obsolete rites functioned as a shadow in the worship prescribed by God in former times, they may not be kept in the time when Christ has fulfilled their significance. The offense is not in the fact of the allegedly 'empty' sign itself, but in the fact that one refuses to follow God's progress in the coming of Christ.

ritu sacrificiorum pro peccato, doctrinam de perfecta Christi satisfactione, contra novos Antichristos hodie propugnamus.

XXVIII Ex his quae de lege ceremoniali Israëlitis data, dicta sunt, judicium fieri debet de Christianorum libertate circa leges judiciales Mosis, quae certe, quatenus datae a Mose, et tali[a] populo, eatenus Christianos non attingunt, nec ligant. Id tamen observandum in legibus illis, admixta fuisse quaedam ceremonialia, quae prorsus hoc tempore sunt antiquata, sive in se,* sive ratione analogiae.* Cujusmodi fuit praeceptum de cadavere suspensi eodem die sepeliendo, ne terra pollueretur quam Jehova Deus noster in possessionem Judaeis tradiderat, Deut. 21, 22. Quod praeceptum inter ea reponendum est, cum similibus mixtis, quae ad Christum respexerunt, propriique typi ac destinati illius fuerunt, ac proinde hoc tempore mortiferi.

XXIX Ad illa vero quae ceremonialia nullo modo sunt, quod attinet, iterum distinctione opus est. Sunt enim primo in lege forensi mandata quaedam immutabilia prorsus. Nam quicquid sancitum est, secundum principia* universalia naturae,* et rationem communem* legis moralis ad commune bonum, sive jubendo, sive vetando, munerando aut puniendo, illud quidem in se* constanter permanet, et quamvis non sit observandum ex vi politiae Mosis, tamen quatenus juris et rationis communis est, et ad naturalem legem* pertinet, nulla occasione et pacto potest contingere, ut refringatur,[b] aut ei cum ratione* aliquis obloquatur, vel cum fructu adversetur, ac proinde ad id libertas Christiana se non extendit.

XXX Sunt alia mere et absolute* politica, eaque communia, quae etsi non mutentur ratione aut substantia,* sed tum sibi in se* ipsis constent, tum in analogia,* secundum quam judicium fieri potest de causis consimilibus; in circumstantiis tamen, mutationes subeunt quam plurimas, et pro tempore, loco, personis, factis, modo, causis atque adjumentis, tum praeteritis, tum etiam praesentibus et futuris, publicis et privatis, variantur. Talia multa quae in talibus circumstan-

[a] huic: original disputation. [b] refigatur: 1642.

that we today defend the doctrine of Christ's perfect satisfaction, over against the modern-day antichrists.[28]

From the things that have been stated about the ceremonial law given to 28
the Israelites we should judge Christian freedom concerning the judicial laws of Moses, which, because they were given by Moses and to such a nation, they neither affect nor bind Christians. And yet we should note that mixed in with those laws were some ceremonial elements, and these are entirely out of date for our time, either because of what they are,* or by analogy.* A commandment of this sort is the one about the corpse of someone who has been hanged, that it must be buried on the same day lest the land should be polluted which Jehovah our Lord had granted to the Jews as a possession (Deuteronomy 21:22 [and 23]). We should place this commandment in the company of those with similar ceremonial admixtures that pointed to Christ and were intended as proper types of him; consequently these are, in our time, deadly.[29]

As far as it concerns laws that are in no way ceremonial, we need to make yet 29
another distinction. For firstly in forensic law there are some commandments that are not at all subject to change. For whatever has been sanctioned for the common* good according to universal principles* of nature* and common sense in moral law (whether by command or prohibition, reward or penalty), that of itself* remains permanently, and even though it is not by the force of Moses' government that we should keep it; yet to the extent that it is marked by law and common reason and pertains to the law of nature,* no occasion or condition can come about to loosen it, nor could anyone have reason* to speak against it or resist it successfully.[30] Consequently Christian freedom does not extend to this point.

Other laws are purely and absolutely* political, and thus common; and 30
though these do not change in nature or substance,* they do sometimes exist in themselves* for themselves, and at other times by analogy* (by which a judgment can be made about the most similar cases). But depending on the circumstances, they undergo very many changes and they vary according to the time, place, persons, deeds, means, causes and the things that support them

28 The relation between the sacrifices of the Old Testament and the satisfaction of Christ is indicated, for example, in *SPT* 29.23–24. Rivetus probably here refers to the alleged Roman Catholic repetition of the sacrifice of Christ in the Eucharist.

29 The same expression "dead and deadly" is used at the end of thesis 25 above; see footnote there. In the seventeenth century it was not uncommon to expose the bodies of dead criminals to the public for much longer than one day.

30 For a similar statement of the abiding validity of the 'moral' precepts in the Mosaic law as pertaining to the 'law of nature,' see *SPT* 18.13–14,38.

tiis, juris privati rationem habent, a Mose fuerunt statuta, quae determinata fuerunt singulari jure, ad modum Reipublicae Judaicae, hoc est personarum, actionum, et finis* particularis, a quibus Christianos liberos esse, certum est.

XXXI Si quae sint autem generis mixti, ut sunt nonnulla, moralia simul et politica, in his τὸ ἠθικὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ πολιτικοῦ ita distinguendum, ut quicquid morale est, permanere sentiamus; quidquid autem politicum, quoad singulares determinationes non astringere. Quibus rite perpensis sponte corruunt, quae ab Anabaptistis quibusdam et aliis fanaticis, exstructa fuerunt argumenta, quibus leges Romanas aut alias quascunque ex Christianorum Rebuspublicis eliminarent, ut in causis civilibus secundum leges Mosis forenses, judicandi necessitatem judicibus imponerent, quae sententia non solum periculosa et turbulenta, sed etiam falsa et stolida merito a doctis judicatur.

XXXII Superest ut de alio gradu libertatis propriae Christianae agamus, seu de ea parte, quae versatur circa liberum exercitium et usum rerum indifferentium sive mediarum, id est, quae suapte natura* nec bonae nec malae sunt morali-

(whether in the past, present, or future; public or private). Many laws of this sort that in such circumstances have the character of a private right had been set up by Moses, which had been determined by a particular right (in the manner of the Jewish republic), that is, of persons, actions and a specific goal;* and it is certain that Christians are free from them.

But if there are laws of the mixed kind, being both moral and political—and 31
there are a few—then we must distinguish between the ethical and the political as follows: we consider anything that is moral to be permanent, but whatever is political is not binding as far as its specific decisions are concerned. But if we ponder these things carefully, then the arguments spontaneously collapse which the Anabaptists and some other fanatics have constructed to eliminate Roman laws or any other laws whatsoever from Christian states, in order to foist upon judges the requirement of passing judgment in civil cases according to the forensic laws of Moses.[31] The experts rightly consider this idea not only dangerous and confusing but also wrong and foolish.

It remains for us to treat the other degree, or part, of freedom that is properly 32
Christian, the part which deals with the exercise and use of things that are indifferent, or 'middle matters.'[32] These are things which by their own nature*

---

31 The picture of the Anabaptist movement in view of the Mosaic law and the Old Testament in general is far from clear. From the main thrust of the movement, one would expect that the radical emphasis on the renewal by the Spirit of Christ should lead to the complete abandonment of the Old Testament in Anabaptist circles. During the turbulences of the 1520s until the 1540s, however, contrary tendencies arose, in particular where Apocalypticism led to revolutionary attempts to change society. The brief but violent 'Davidic Kingdom' of Jan van Leiden at Münster was justified by references to Old Testament prophecies and to a selection of Old Testament institutions. See Williams, *Radical Reformation*, 505–523, 553–588; Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium: Revolutionary Millenarians and Mystical Anarchists of the Middle Ages* (rev. ed., New York: Oxford University Press, 1970), 234–280. On the deviance of this 'revolutionary' view from the Anabaptist mainstream; see William R. Estep, *The Anabaptist Story: An Introduction to Sixteenth-Century Anabaptist*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 265–266. Another reason for the appeal to Mosaic laws may have been the hostile treatment of Anabaptists by the various governmental officers. For this latter aspect see thesis 18, note 19 above.

32 The term *adiaphora* was used already in Antiquity, mainly by Stoic thinkers. It became notorious by the 'adiaphoristic controversy' in the Lutheran church in the 1540s and 1550s. In response to the 'Leipzig Interim' imposed by Emperor Charles V in 1548, leading Wittenberg theologians defended the concessions made in church order and worship by appealing to the idea that these were 'indifferent matters' as distinct from the key elements of preaching, baptism, and the Lord's Supper. This position was attacked by Matthias Flacius Illyricus, who held a very restricted notion of *adiaphora*, and claimed that in the given circumstances, even a matter in itself unessential could not be treated

ter, nec ulla lege prohibitae aut imperatae, ac proinde quibus vel bene, vel male uti, vel plane non uti quis possit; cujus partis cognitio perquam necessaria est, cum ad desperationem, tum ad superstitionem tollendam. Nam ubi hominum animi dubitatione sunt impliciti, dum controvertitur num his aut illis rebus* Deus nos uti velit; cujus voluntas* omnibus factis nostris praeire debet; nisi succurratur, facilis est in omnimodas superstitiones lapsus. Itaque cui scrupulus fuerit semel injectus in usu lanae aut lini, nec de cannabe postea securus erit; aut si luce divini verbi* careat, et tamen scrupulis non moveatur, profana securitate, abjecto Dei timore, viam, quam expeditam alias non videbit, sibi ruina faciet.

XXXIII Cum igitur ἀδιάφορα, non per se bona vel mala censeantur, sed ex usus ipsorum circumstantiis; diligenter expendendum quid sit in talibus rebus* libertati nostrae concedendum. Nam etsi res* omnes externae hujus generis, ei videantur a Paulo subjici, Rom. 14, 14. hanc tamen libertatem duplici lege circumscriptam Deus esse voluit, lege videlicet fidei et caritatis. Prima requiritur ad id, ut libertatis ratio* animis nostris apud Deum constet, ut de legitimo rerum* indifferentium usu recte simus instructi, et sufficienter confirmati, et nihil dubitante conscientia aut agamus, aut audeamus. Quod enim per se non est commune* aut impurum, in eo qui illud existimat impurum, contaminatur, Rom. 14, 14.

XXXIV Qui ergo de libertate sua nondum sunt certi, ideoque in usu haesitant, dubitant, aut ex aliqua superstitiosa opinione laborant, eis rerum* alioquin indifferentium usus non est indifferens aut concessus, quia quod faciunt, ex fide non faciunt, Rom. 14, 5. 14. 22. et 23. neque possunt* bona Dei accipere, animo fluctuante et dubia conscientia, cum gratiarum actione ex animo profecta qui Dei beneficentiam et bonitatem in suis donis agnoscat, qua tamen sola, in usum nostrum sanctificantur creaturae Dei, 1 Tim. 4, 5.

---

as permissible. The later *Formula of Concord* (1577) adopted Flacius's view of 'indifferent matters.' Most Calvinist theologians also maintained a rather strict view of *adiaphora* in questions of church order and liturgy, in the sense that here the express prescripts of Scripture should be followed. In the field of morals, however, the category of 'indifferent matters' is advocated to avoid an overly anxious attitude bound to human custom rather than to divine command.

are neither good nor bad in a moral sense, and which neither have been prohibited nor commanded by any law, and so they are things that anyone could use in the right way, or the wrong way, or plainly not at all. It is very important to understand this part in order to remove any feeling of despair or superstition about them. For whenever people's hearts are tied up with doubt, controversy arises over whether it is the will of God (and his will* should show us the way in all our actions) to use these or those things.* Unless help is offered, it is easy to fall into all manner of superstitious ideas. In this way, once a scruple has befallen someone in the use of wool or linen, he will thereafter not be entirely sure about hemp, either.[33] Or if someone should lack the light of God's Word* and still not be affected by any scruple, he may out of profane carelessness cast off his reverence for God and will cause the way that he otherwise will not see as unencumbered to become his own ruin.

33 Therefore since indifferent things are judged to be good or bad not in or of themselves but from the circumstances of their use, we must ponder carefully what in matters* of this sort should be left to our freedom. For although it seems that Paul subjected everything* of this outward kind to our freedom (Romans 14:14), it was still God's will to restrict this freedom with a double law: the law of faith and love.[34] The first of these is required for the fact that the reason* for the freedom in our hearts is with God, so that we are rightly taught and sufficiently established in the lawful use of things* that are indifferent, and so that we do them, or dare to do them with a conscience that doubts nothing. For that which of itself is not common* or unclean, to him who considers that unclean it does become unclean (Romans 14:14).

34 And so those who are not yet certain about the freedom they have, and so hesitate or doubt in using it, or are laboring under some superstitious idea, for them the use of things* that otherwise are indifferent is not indifferent or allowable because what they are doing is done by them not out of faith (Romans 14:5, 14, 22 and 23), and since their hearts are wavering and their consciences doubting,[35] they are unable* to receive God's good gifts with a giving of thanks that comes from the heart that acknowledges God's beneficence and goodness in his gifts—which is still the only way whereby the things God created are made holy for our use (1 Timothy 4:[4 and] 5).[36]

---

33 This argument, including the example of wool, linen, and hemp, is borrowed from Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.19.7.

34 Note that the initial description of Christian freedom in thesis 7 did already include 'faith' and 'love' as its adjuncts.

35 Allusion to James 1:6–8, 17.

36 This passage resembles Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.19.8.

XXXV Fidei hujus praelucentis fax non solum rei* quae media dicitur, naturam* investigat et aperit, num videlicet talis sit in se;* sed etiam dum *corda purificat*, Act. 15, 5. mentem et conscientiam ab inquinatione conservat, facit ut res illae cupide non appetantur, superbe non efferantur, luxuriose non effundantur, et ea quae per se licita erant, his vitiis non contaminentur. Et ut pura conscientia Dei donis, *mundi* pure utantur, *quibus omnia munda sunt*, Tit. 1, 15. qui *sive edunt sive bibunt, sive quid faciunt, omnia in gloriam Dei faciunt*, 1 Cor. 10, 31.

XXXVI Coercetur praeterea libertas in talibus, per legem caritatis; quae exigit ut fratrum infirmorum, qui adhuc de libertatis suae praerogativa non satis edocti sunt, habeatur ratio; ut eorum captum moderemur, idque tantisper dum possint erudiri, eorumque aedificatio procuretur:[a] non enim semper *omnia quae licent, etiam aedificant*, 1 Cor. 10, 23. Quapropter idem Apostolus inquiebat, *Si esca scandalizet fratrem meum, non manducabo carnem in aeternum, ne fratrem meum scandalizem*, Rom. 14, 22. 1 Cor. 8, 13. Qua in re* tamen infirmorum est et ignorantium, firmioribus jus et libertatem suam relinquere, et edentem, gnarum suae libertatis, non condemnare, Rom. 14, 15.

XXXVII Sed quamvis infirmis ad aedificationem cedendum sit, obstinate tamen superstitiosis, aut malitiose insidiantibus, nihil in praejudicium nostrae libertatis est concedendum: ne abstinentia nostra eos in impia sua superstitione confirmemus, aut alioqui firmis et in libertate sua bene institutis praejudicemus. Ideo Paulus gravissime reprehendit Petrum, qui dum se a Gentibus subduceret, ne Judaeos offenderet, hos in sua pertinacia confirmabat, illos dissimulatione sua offendebat, Gal. 2, 11. At prudentiae Christianae in utraque occasione speciem* ostendit Paulus, cum Timotheum circumcidit, infirmitatis Judaeorum rationem habens, Act. 16, 3. Titum noluit circumcidere, dum adversus obstinatos et insidiatores vidit libertatem Christianam esse defendendam, Gal. 2, 3. 4.

XXXVIII Illa autem fides quae quid in iis rebus* licet, determinat, simul etiam docet, libertatem nostram semper manere illibatam, etsi nos infirmis fratribus accommodemus. Quia distinguit inter libertatem ipsam, et libertatis usum, et cum libertas in conscientia sit, ac Deum respiciat, usus autem in rebus externis ver-

[a] aedificationem procuremus: 1642.

The lantern of this faith which lights the way not only investigates the 35
nature* of the thing* that is called 'the middle thing' and reveals whether or not it is middling in and of itself.* But also, while it cleanses their hearts (Acts 15:9) it guards the mind and conscience against uncleanliness and sees to it that such things are not wantonly longed-for, conducted in pride, or extravagantly poured out, and that these vices do not befoul whatever in itself is permissible. And it sees to it that they who are clean make pure use of God's gifts with a pure conscience, "for whom all things are pure" (Titus 1:15), who "whether they eat or whether they drink, or whatever they do, they do everything to the glory of God" (1 Corinthians 10:31).

Freedom in matters of this sort is moreover kept in check by the law of love, 36
which demands that we take into account our weaker brothers who have not yet been instructed sufficiently about the privilege of their own freedom, in order to guide their comprehension (and to do that for as long as they can be taught) and to attend to their upbuilding. For not always do "all the things that are allowed also build up" (1 Corinthians 10:23). For this reason the same apostle said: "If what I eat is a stumbling-block for my brother, I shall never eat meat again, lest I cause my brother to stumble" (Romans 14:22; 1 Corinthians 8:13). But in this matter* it is the responsibility of the weaker and uninformed brothers to leave untouched the rights and freedoms of those who are stronger, and not to condemn him who, knowing his own freedom, does eat (Romans 14:15).

But while we should yield to the weak for the purpose of edifying them, to 37
those who are stubbornly superstitious or who are lying in ambush with evil intent we must give up nothing that might lead them to prejudge our freedom, so that we do not by our abstinence confirm them in their evil superstition, nor should we otherwise prejudge those who are strong and well-taught in their own freedom. Accordingly Paul chided Peter very severely because, when he withdrew himself from the gentiles in order not to offend the Jews, he confirmed the Jews in their stubbornness and offended the gentiles by his hypocrisy (Galatians 2:11). But in these two cases* Paul displayed an illustration of Christian wisdom: when he circumcised Timothy out of consideration for the weakness of the Jews (Acts 16:3), and when he did not wish to circumcise Titus after he saw that he had to defend Christian freedom over against those who were stubborn and lying in ambush (Galatians 2:3–4).[37]

But at the same time that faith determines what is allowed in these things* 38
it also teaches that our freedom always remains undiminished, even though we accommodate ourselves to our weak brothers. For faith makes a distinction between freedom itself and the use of freedom, and since the freedom is in

37 For the twofold example of Timothy and Titus see also Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.19.12.

setur, in quibus negotium ei est non cum solo Deo sed cum hominibus, judicat apud eos *non omnia expedire, cum omnia liceant*, 1 Cor. 6, 12. et libertate utendum non esse, *nisi ad aedificationem*, Rom. 14, 19.

XXXIX Quomodo etiam libertatem conscientiarum non impediri agnoscimus, quia non ipsa, sed tantum opus externum ligatur, cum rerum mediarum usus coercetur per legem aliquam politicam, vel constitutionem Ecclesiasticam: Deus enim solus proprie* conscientias ligat, ut diximus. Sed tamen Magistratus aliquando Reipublicae bono aliquid per se ἀδιάφορον potest jubere ut fiat, vel prohibere ne fiat; et Ecclesia propter εὐταξίαν aliquid in simili materia constituere, ita ut tamen in conscientias nullum sibi sumat imperium: quo casu excepto, nemo rebellionis studio, citra peccatum, talibus constitutionibus resisteret, aut jure refragaretur;[a] qui potius dum conscientiam suam tueri vellet, eam in periculum adduceret, utpote quae ob rebellionem damnum pateretur.

XL Cum autem qui ea praescribunt (si quidem jure suo non abutantur, nec limites jurisdictionis suae transcendant) non intendant res* medias facere simpliciter necessarias, sed tantum ex hypothesi circumstantiarum ob quas imperantur aut prohibentur; non peccabit, qui cessantibus circumstantiis, extra contemptus et scandali casum, praesertim si adsit necessitatis telum, libertatis suae usum repetet, tales enim constitutiones tunc ligandi aut obligandi vim

[a] constitutionibus resistere debet, aut jure potest: original disputation.

our conscience and looks to God, while the use of it is concerned with external things in which the handling of it is not with God only but with people, it judges that among people "not all things are expedient, though all things are allowed" (1 Corinthians 6:12) and that we must not use our freedom "except for building up" (Romans 14:19).

In this way we acknowledge that even the freedom of our consciences is 39
not hindered, because when some political law or ecclesiastical regulation restricts the use of the middle things* it is not the freedom itself but only the outward deed that is bound. For strictly* speaking it is only God who binds the consciences, as we have said. And yet on occasion a magistrate can, for the good of the nation, order or forbid something to be done that of itself is an intermediate thing.[38] And the church may decide something of a similar substance for the sake of good order—in such a way, however, that it does not assume for itself any power over the conscience. This case excluded, no-one would resist such regulations out of a desire for rebellion without sinning or rightly oppose them;—who, whereas he would prefer to guard his conscience, would rather endanger it since it would suffer harm on account of the rebelliousness.

But while the magistrate or the church prescribes those actions (if, at least, 40
they are not abusing their rights or transgressing the boundaries of their jurisdiction) and have as their intention not to make the middle matters* simply necessary but only because it is on the supposition of the circumstances that they are being commanded or forbidden, then the person will not be committing a sin who, when those circumstances cease to exist, while avoiding an instance of being condemned or scandalized, reverts to using his own freedom, especially if the sword of necessity threatens.[39] For we do not think that regula-

38 Cf. Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.19.15–16, where two forms of 'government' (*regimen*) are distinguished: the one spiritual, the other civil. Calvin advocates a sharp separation of these two domains: in the spiritual realm, the human conscience is internally bound only to God's command and is free toward human government; one should not infer, however, that the same applies in the external and civil domain: here one is bound to obey human laws instituted by the government. For the relation between the notion of Christian freedom and political issues in Reformed theology see Henk van den Belt, who argues that in the development of Reformed theology, for example in the *SPT*, the relativizing power of Christian liberty over against persecuting magistrates turned into a legitimation of the political *status quo* under Reformed magistrates ("Spiritual and Bodily Freedom," 164).

39 The expression 'sword of necessity' is derived from the Latin phrase *durum necessitatis telum* or *durum telum necessitas* which literally means 'the sword of necessity is severe' or 'necessity is a severe sword' and is equivalent to the French proverb *nécessité n'a point de loi*, necessity has no law.

retinere non censemus. Ad res* autem per se bonas vel malas, si homines statuta sua extendant, illud insuper habendum esse asserere non dubitamus, quia nulla est periculi aut offendiculi causa, qua quod Deus jubet, negligere, vel quod prohibet, facere possimus impune, ideoque non in gratiam proximi Deus est offendendus, Matt. 5, 29. et 30. et 10, 37. Nec magistratui contra verbum Dei aliquid statuenti, aut vim conscientiis facienti, obtemperandum est, Act. 4, 19. 24. et 5, 29.

XLI Adhuc de objectis et gradibus, aut partibus libertatis Christianae dictum est, in quibus quae ad ejus materiam explicandam necessaria fuerunt, considerata sunt; ex quibus quid de *Forma* ejus sentiendum sit, facile perspici potest, quae consistit in bonorum illorum possessione et fruitione, per testificationem Spiritus Sancti, qua in animis fidelium obsignat indubitatam illam persuasionem et πληροφορίαν de υἱοθεσίᾳ, qua ex Diaboli mancipiis, facti filii Dei, muniuntur adversus omnes tentationes et insultus, peccati, legis et condemnationis, et de sua immunitate ab omni servitute praeterita certi redduntur, Rom. 8, 14. 15. et seqq. 2 Cor. 1, 22. Gal. 4, 6. et 7. Eph. 4, 30.

XLII Finis* proximus,* est conscientiarum Christianarum tranquillitas, Luc. 1, 74. Rom. 14, 5. et *ut manumissi a peccato, servi autem facti Deo, habeant fructum suum in sanctificationem, finem autem vitam aeternam*, Rom. 6, 22. Propterea in iis qui libertate donati sunt, sequuntur eam tamquam adjuncta necessaria, pax, justitia, bona conscientia, et gaudium spiritus, Rom. 14, 17. Finis autem summus idem qui aliorum Dei beneficiorum, *Laus gloriosae Dei gratiae*, Eph. 1, 14.

XLIII Quoniam autem libertas illa gratiae,* a libertate gloriae distinguitur, eam[a] nondum actu possident, qui illa priore fruuntur in hac vita: jus tamen ad eam habent tamquam filii Dei, cujus constituti sunt haeredes, Christi cohaeredes, Rom. 8, 17. Sunt enim filii resurrectionis, et filii Dei, per Spiritum, *qui est arrhabo*, sigillum et *primitiae istius haereditatis*, Luc. 20, 36. Gal. 4, 6. 2 Cor. 1,

[a] quam: original disputation.

tions of such a sort then retain the power of binding or obligating. But if people extend their own rules to include things* that of themselves are good or evil, we don't hesitate to affirm that we should consider this action to be over and above [their right], because there does not exist any cause of danger or offense that we should neglect what God commands or with impunity do what God prohibits us to do, and for this reason we should not, for the sake of our neighbor, offend God (Matthew 5:29–30 and 10:37). Nor should we obey the magistrate who makes some rule contrary to God's Word or who does violence to our consciences (Acts 4:19, 24 and 5:29).

Until now we have spoken about the objects and degrees, or parts, of Chris- 41
tian freedom, wherein we considered the things that were needed to explain its subject-matter. From these it is easy to see what we should think about the form of Christian freedom.[40] This form exists in having and enjoying those good things by the witness of the Holy Spirit with which He seals that undoubted conviction and full assurance[41] in the hearts of believers about their sonship whereby they have been turned from slaves of the devil into sons of God, and are protected against all the temptations and attacks of sin, the law, and condemnation, and are made certain about their exemption from every bygone slavery (Romans 8:14–15 and following; 2 Corinthians 1:22; Galatians 4:6–7; Ephesians 4:30).

The proximate* goal* is the tranquility of the consciences of Christians 42
(Luke 1:74; Romans 14:5), who "having been released from sin and become servants of God, have their reward unto holiness, while the goal is life eternal" (Romans 6:22). Therefore, for those who have been granted freedom there follows, as virtues that necessarily accompany them: peace, righteousness, a good conscience, and the joy of the Spirit (Romans 14:17). But the highest goal is the same as the one for God's other benefits: "the praise of his glorious grace" (Ephesians 1:14).

But because that freedom of grace* is distinguished from the freedom of 43
glory, those who in this life enjoy the first kind do not yet actually possess the second one; but as children of God they do have the right to it, as they have become his heirs, and are co-heirs with Christ (Romans 8:17). For they are children of the resurrection and sons of God through the Spirit, who is "the pledge, the seal and first-fruits of that inheritance" (Luke 20:36; Galatians

40 In scholastic terminology drawing on Aristotle, the 'form' is the normative description to which something should conform in order to be what it is. Christian freedom finds its fulfillment in the "undoubted conviction and full assurance in the hearts of believers" produced by the Holy Spirit.

41 On the importance of the Greek word *plērophoria* see *SPT* 30.38, note 20.

22. Eph. 1, 14. ubi nominatim obsignatio Spiritus *qui est arrhabo haereditatis nostrae*, dicitur facta εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς περιποιήσεως.

XLIV Ad eam haereditatem pertinet, non solum immortalitas animarum beata; sed etiam resurrectio et gloria corporum, quae, etsi servitus corruptionis et mors etiam ipsa, adhuc nexa in vinculis teneat; exspectant tamen una cum animabus ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης, καὶ ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν, in die quo a se redemptos, Christus liberali manu asseret; interim sub hujus liberationis spe quiescentes, donec *abscondita* ad tempus *vita eorum cum Christo in Deo, quando Christus manifestatus fuerit, cum illo etiam manifestentur in gloria*, Rom. 8, 21. et 23. Gal. 5, 17. Joh. 6, 44. Col. 3, 3. et 4.

XLV Hujus doctrinae multiplex usus ex dictis constare potest, secundum varios libertatis gradus. Ex primis hoc habent credentes, quod pacata conscientia non amplius terrentur minis legalibus, et filiali obedientia secundum legis directionem sine coactione delectantur, Ps. 1, 2. Deinde confidunt obsequia sua quamvis infantilia atque adeo imperfecta, Patri benevolo non displicere, sed ab eo in dilecto suo acceptari.

XLVI Ex duobus postremis, hunc colligunt fructum, quod sciunt conscientias suas exemptas esse ab omnium hominum potestate, 1 Cor. 3, 21. et 7, 23. Quod veris cultibus, i. spiritualibus, Deo, non creaturis servire discunt, ne sibi aut hominibus in malum indulgeant. Quod concordia in Ecclesia retinetur, observata in rebus* adiaphoris libertate Christiana; et Dei donis ex fide utentes in usum in quem a Deo donata sunt, eundem usum ex caritate ad proximi aedificationem et communem* salutem moderentur.

XLVII Patet etiam, libertatem illam non esse immunitatem ab omnibus legibus divinis et humanis; non esse licentiam vivendi ex animi sententia et indulgendi concupiscentiis carnis, neque libertatem a civili obligatione, servitutibus

4:6; 2 Corinthians 1:22). In Ephesians 1:14 the seal of the Spirit "who is the pledge of our inheritance" is said explicitly to have been made "until we acquire possession of it."

To this inheritance belongs also the blessed immortality of our souls, as well as the resurrection and the glorified state of our bodies. Although the slavery to corruption and even death itself still keep our bodies bound up in chains, believers do look forward, along with their souls, to the "freedom of glory" and "the redemption of our bodies" on the day when Christ with open hand[42] will declare that they have been redeemed by him. Meanwhile they rest secure in the hope of this freedom "until they, whose lives for a time have been kept safe with Christ in God, when Christ appears will also appear in glory with him" (Romans 8:21 and 23; Galatians 5:17; John 6:44; Colossians 3:3 and 4). 44

From what has been said it can be determined what is the manifold use of this doctrine, following the various degrees of freedom. From the first[43] [two degrees] those who believe possess the fact that their consciences have been put at ease, and they are no longer terrified by the threats of the law, and without compulsion they take delight in the obedience of sonship by the guidance of the law (Psalm 1:2). And they are also confident that their acts of obedience, although they are immature and still not perfect, do not displease their benevolent Father, but are acceptable to him in his love.[44] 45

From the two last degrees they reap the benefit that they know their consciences have been released from the power of all people (1 Corinthians 3:21 and 7:23); and that with true worship (namely, spiritual) they learn to serve God instead of creatures, so that they do not give in to themselves or other people for evil. And that harmony in the church is maintained, while Christian freedom is preserved in indifferent things.* And that they are employing God's gifts out of faith for the use to which God had given them, and to guide that use in love for the upbuilding of the neighbor and the general* wellbeing. 46

It is also clear that this freedom does not constitute exemption from all laws (both divine and human ones) and that it is not a license for living by the feelings of one's heart and of indulging the sinful desires of the flesh, nor a release 47

42 The Latin expression *manu liberali* may be an allusion to 'manumission' as the act by which slaves were set free; cf. thesis 4 above.

43 The first two degrees of freedom—that of the curse and demand of the moral law—are discussed in theses 11–16 above; see thesis 10, note 14 above. The 'two last degrees' stand for the freedom from human traditions (theses 17–19) and the freedom under the New Testament from the ceremonial law (theses 20–23), elaborated on in the theses 24–40.

44 The final sentence of thesis 45 seems to stem from Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.19.5. This statement was not made so clearly before by Rivetus, although he here includes it in a summary of the earlier discussion.

et tributis. Nihil enim impedit quominus qui spiritualiter liberi sunt, corpore serviant, 1 Cor. 7, 21. et Eph. 6, 5. *Vos servi obedite carnalibus vestris Dominis, tamquam Domino*. Manent igitur Christiani suis Regibus et Magistratibus subditi ut prius, Rom. 13, 1. et serio damnantur omnes qui praetextu libertatis Christianae dum Magistratuum jugum excutere conantur, se Diabolo mancipant, *libertatem in carnis lasciviam convertentes*, Gal. 5, 13.

XLVIII Pugnant etiam cum libertate Christiana somnia Judaeorum de regno Messiae temporali, nec eam attingunt magnificae Stoicorum jactantiae, quibus non solum παραδόξως, sed etiam παραλόγως, *solum suum sapientem liberum* faciunt, etsi vanitatis et praesumptionis mancipium. Quod paradoxum in Ecclesia sanctificatum dedit his verbis August. *Bonus etiamsi serviat, liber est, malus etiamsi regnet, servus est, nec unius hominis, sed quod gravius est, tot dominorum quot vitiorum*, *De civit. Dei*, lib. 4. cap. 3.[a]

XLIX Sed in suavissimam illam doctrinam periculosissime omnium Pontificii impingunt, et qui cum Pontificiis sentiunt Sociniani, et alii qui eorum dogmata interpolant, cum usibus legis, de quibus antea dictum est, non contenti, Evangelium nobis in legem exigentem transformant, Christum novum Legislatorem proponunt, legem Mosis non tam obedientia sua adimplentem, quam nova praecepta addendo perficientem; ut in legis observatione justitiam, credentes quaerant, et per eam vitam aeternam exspectent. Qua doctrina pervertitur Christianismus, dum Christi officium obscuratur, et praecipuum ejus beneficium tollitur, et salus et consolatio conscientiarum funditus evertitur.

[a] Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 4.3 (CCSL 47:101).

from civic responsibility, duties, and payments. For there is nothing to prevent those who are free spiritually from serving with their bodies (1 Corinthians 7:21); "servants obey your earthly masters, as to the Lord" (Ephesians 6:5). Therefore Christians are subject to their kings and magistrates, as before (Romans 13:1), and they seriously condemn all those who under the pretext of Christian freedom attempt to shake off the yoke of magistrates and who enslave themselves to the devil by "turning their freedom into an opportunity for the flesh" (Galatians 5:13).

48 The things that the Jews have dreamed up about the temporal kingdom of the Messiah are also in conflict with Christian freedom;[45] nor is the freedom affected by the magnificent arrogance of the Stoics, who paradoxically and illogically make only their own wise men to be free,[46] even though they are possessed by vanity and presumption. Augustine gave this paradox a special status in the church with the following words: "The good man, although he is a slave, is free; but the bad man, even if he reigns, is a slave, and he is a slave not of one man but, what is far more grievous, of as many masters as he has vices" (*City of God*, book 4 chapter 3).

49 But of all people it is the papal teachers who most dangerously affect this very gratifying doctrine, and also the Socinians who are of like mind with the papal teachers, as well as the others who refurbish their teachings; because, not being content with the uses of the law as we described them earlier, they turn the Gospel into a demanding law for us and they present Christ as a second Lawgiver who does not so much fulfill the law of Moses by his own obedience as to perfect it by means of adding new precepts, in order that believers should seek righteousness in the keeping of the law and hope to gain eternal life through it. But Christianity is overturned by this teaching since it hides from view the office of Christ, and especially takes away his benefits, and completely overturns the foundation of our salvation and the comfort of our consciences.[47]

---

45 Rivetus is probably referring to the Rabbinic tradition, not to actual Jewish communities of his own time. The *Augsburg Confession* (article 17) issues a condemnation of "certain Jewish opinions, that before the resurrection of the dead the godly shall take possession of the kingdom of the world;" cf. also the *Second Helvetic Confession*, art. 11.14, which replaces "opinions" by the more pejorative "dreams."

46 Cf., for instance, Cicero, *De Finibus* 3.75 (LCL 17:296): "Rightly will he be said to own all things, who alone knows how to use all things; rightly also will he be styled beautiful, for the features of the soul are fairer than those of the body; rightly the one and only free man, as subject to no man's authority, and slave of no appetite; rightly unconquerable, for though his body be thrown into fetters, no bondage can enchain his soul."

47 See *SPT* 22.36–51 for an extensive discussion of the claim by both Roman Catholic and Socinian writers that Christ added his own precepts to the laws of the Old Testament. And

August. Tom. 4. *Quaest. Veteris et Novi Testam.* LXI.[a]

Haec quae periculosa non sunt, sic servanda mandata sunt, ut non obsint, si ex necessitate fuerint admissa, quia non ad salutem, sed ad reverentiam mandata sunt. Illud autem quod omnino non licet, nec aliqua necessitate mitigatur, ut admissum non obsit, est semper illicitum.*[b]

Bernard. *Tractat. de Grat. et Libero Arbitrio.*[c]

Cum nobis triplex proposita sit libertas, a peccato, a miseria, a necessitate; hanc ultimo loco positam contulit nobis in conditione natura: in prima restauramur a gratia, media reservatur nobis in patria. Indicatur prima libertas naturae, secunda gratiae, tertia gloriae: prima habet plurimum honoris, secunda plurimum virtutis, tertia novissima, cumulum jucunditatis.*

[a] Pseudo-Augustine, *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti* 61 (MPL 35:2257), now attributed to Ambrosiaster (CSEL 50:110). [b] est semper illicitum: missing in the original disputation. [c] Bernard of Clairvaux, *De gratia et libero arbitrio* c. 3 (*Sämtliche Werke* 1:184).

note the fact that the decisive objection against this idea is found in the Christological basis: the office of Christ.

[Pseudo-Augustine] *Question 61 on the Old and New Testament*

It has been commanded that these things which are not dangerous should be observed in such a way that they would not be harmful if they are admitted out of necessity,* because they have been commanded not for salvation but for their reverence. But that which is entirely unallowed and also not mitigated by any kind of necessity that would not make its admission a hindrance, that is never permissible.

Bernard, *Treatise on Grace and Free Choice*

Since a three-fold freedom is set before us, freedom from sin, from misery, and from necessity.* The last one of these is bestowed on us in the state of nature; by the first freedom [from sin] we are restored by grace, while the second one is kept for us in the fatherland.[48] The first is called the freedom of nature, the second one is called freedom of grace, and the third, the freedom of glory. The first possesses great honor, the second great virtue, and the third, last virtue, possesses the pinnacle of delight.

48 Hebrews 11:14–16.

DISPUTATIO XXXVI

De Cultu Invocationis[a]

Praeside D. ANTONIO WALAEO
Respondente ANTONIO DELIENO

THESIS I Quandoquidem de Dei erga Ecclesiam beneficiis huc usque est actum; sequitur jam ut de reliquis officiis nostris, et de mediis per quae haec beneficia nobis communicantur, deinceps agamus.[b]

II Inter praecipua nostra officia atque hujus communicationis media, est vera veri Dei invocatio, seu adoratio. Quae veluti clavis est, qua divinae beneficentiae thesauri a nobis recluduntur, et debita Deo gratitudo a fideli corde rependitur, quemadmodum id utrumque conjungit David, Psalm. 50, 14. *Sacrifica Deo laudem et redde Excelso vota tua, atque invoca eum tempore angustiae, eripiam te, ut honore afficias me*.

III Ut autem haec tam necessaria invocationis doctrina compendiose tractetur; Primo, quis sit invocandus, explicandum est; Secundo, per quem; Tertio, quomodo; Quarto, quodnam sit invocationis objectum, circa quod vera invocatio versatur.

IV Deum solum, nempe Patrem, Filium, ac Spiritum Sanctum, summum omnium bonorum datorem, et malorum averruncum, nobis esse invocandum, docent omnia invocandi praecepta, quae Scriptura diversis in locis inculcat, quorum summa exstat in verbis Christi, Matt. 4, 10. *Dominum Deum tuum adorabis, et ei soli servies*, docent omnes divinae promissiones, quarum κολοφών continetur in dicto Apostoli, Rom. 10, 13. *Quisquis invocaverit nomen Domini, salvus erit*. Docent postremo omnia exempla Sanctorum in Veteri ac Novo Testamento, quorum nemo unquam preces suas ad alium quam ad verum Deum direxit. Quemadmodum et ipse Christus discipulos suos eas non alio dirigere docuit, quam ad *Patrem nostrum qui est in coelis*, Matt. 6, 9.

---

[a] For the Latin text of disputation 36 see also the *Enchiridion Religionis Reformatae* (*Opera* 1:104–108). [b] In the *Enchiridion* this chapter follows the one on the Decalogue, and thus this thesis is rephrased: Quandoquidem de Decalogo huc usque est actum; sequitur iam ut de reliquis officiis et precatione, medio per quod Dei beneficia erga Ecclesiam nobis communicantur, deinceps agamus (*Opera* 1:104a).

DISPUTATION 36

On the Religious Practice of Invocation

President: Antonius Walaeus[1]
Respondent: Antonius Delienus[2]

Since up to this point we have given a treatment of God's benefits to the Church, it now follows that we should treat next our own remaining duties, and the means through which these benefits are communicated to us. 1

Among the foremost of our duties and the means of this communication is the true invocation, or adoration, of the true God. This invocation is like a key whereby we unlock the treasuries of divine benefits, and repay to God the debt of gratitude from our faithful hearts, in the same way that David links the two together: "Offer sacrifices of thanksgiving to God and render your vows to the Most High and call upon him in the time of trouble and I shall deliver you, that you may glorify me" (Psalm 50:14 [and 15]). 2

For a succinct treatment of this doctrine of invocation that is so necessary we should explain: 1) who is to be invoked; 2) through whom he should be invoked; 3) how he should be invoked; 4) what should be the object with which true invocation deals. 3

All the rules of invocation taught in various places of Scripture instruct us that, as the greatest giver of all good things and who averts evil, we should call upon God alone, namely the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. These rules are summarized in Christ's words: "You shall worship the Lord your God and him only you shall serve" (Matthew 4:10). The same is taught by all God's promises, the summation of which occurs in the Apostle's saying (Romans 10:13): "Whoever calls upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." And lastly, the same is taught in the Old and New Testaments by all the examples of the saints, none of whom ever directed his prayer to anyone other than the true God. In the same manner Christ himself instructed his disciples to direct their prayers to none other than "our Father who is in heaven" (Matthew 6:9). 4

---

1 In the *Opera omnia* of Walaeus (1643) the text of this disputation has been included in the *Enchiridion Religionis Reformatae*.

2 Nicolaas Anthony van der Deliën was born 1600 in Middelburg; the date of his matriculation is unknown. He defended this disputation in 1623. He was ordained in Stad aan 't Haringvliet in 1623, in Nieuwerkerk (Zeeland) in 1629, and in 's-Hertogenbosch in 1630; he died in 1630 (Van Lieburg, *Repertorium*, 47). He is mentioned in *BLGNP* 5:551 and some biographical information is offered in *NNBW* 8:377–378.

v Demonstrant* id ipsum quoque conditiones, quae in eo qui invocandus est, requiruntur. Nam et cordium scrutatorem esse oportet, ut in Spiritu et veritate adorantes ab hypocritis possit dignoscere; quod soli Deo in invocatione competere testatur Salomo, 1 Reg. 8, 39. et Paulus Rom. 8, 27. Deinde oportet eum esse talem cui fiducia nostra, non solum tamquam munifico ac benevolo Patri, sed etiam tamquam Omnipotenti rerum Domino inniti possit; quam fiduciam in solo Deo locandam esse docet Propheta Jeremias cap. 17 vers. 7. et idem Apostolus Paulus Rom. 10, 14. Denique oportet eum necessitates communes* et singulares, tam internas quam externas, omnium eorum qui ipsum per totum mundum invocant, cognoscere; quod soli omniscio ac omnipraesenti Deo convenit, ut videre est Ps. 139, 2. Matt. 6, 32. Hebr. 4, 13. etc.

vi Duabus primis conditionibus nihil plane potest opponi. Quod vero tertiae Pontificii opponunt speculum Trinitatis, in quo omnia haec inferiora resplendeant, ineptum est et ad rem non facit; tum quia id extra Scripturam asseritur, ac proinde tam facile rejicitur quam affirmatur; tum quia scientiae* divinae objecta beatis communicantur per actum* voluntarium et arbitrarium, non per naturalem* aut necessarium. Nam et *Angeli qui semper vident faciem Patris*,

The same is shown* also by the requirements that must be met in the one who is going to be invoked. For he should be someone who examines the hearts, so that he can tell apart the ones who worship in Spirit and truth from those who are hypocrites. Solomon (1 Kings 8:39) and Paul (Romans 8:27) bear witness that it is only God who meets this requirement. Secondly, he should be the kind of person in whom we can place our trust, not just as a bountiful and kind-hearted father, but also as an almighty Lord. The prophet Jeremiah (17:7) and also the apostle Paul (Romans 10:14) teach that we should place this trust in God alone. And lastly, he should be someone who knows the general* and specific needs (both internal and external ones) of all those people throughout the whole world who call upon him. And this requirement is met only by the omniscient and omnipresent God, as seen in Psalm 139:2, Matthew 6:32, Hebrews 4:13, etc. 5

There is clearly nothing that can be brought in to contradict the first two requirements. And what the papal teachers put over against the third requirement is foolish and beside the point: the 'mirror of the Trinity' wherein all these earthly things shine forth.[3] This is foolish because their claim is made apart from Scripture (and therefore as easily rejected as it is stated), and because it is by an act* that is voluntary and of free choice and not by a natural* and necessary act whereby the objects of divine knowledge* are communicated to the blessed ones.[4] For even the "angels who always behold the Father's face" 6

3 The doctrine of *speculum Trinitatis*, or 'mirror of the Trinity,' concerns the supernatural knowledge of angels and saints (and the human soul of Christ) of things that would otherwise remain hidden to them, especially the thoughts and intentions of the human heart (but also future or hypothetically future events), through their direct cognition of the divine essence. Its ultimate source is the famous distinction made by Augustine in *De Genesi ad Litteram*, IV.22.39, between the morning and evening knowledge of the angels, the first referring to their knowledge of things in the divine Word and the second to their knowledge of things in themselves. Aquinas (*Summa theologiae* 2/2.83.4) argues for the saints' knowledge of human hearts, and their ability to hear prayers; although he does not use the phrase 'mirror of the Trinity,' this beatific mode of cognition was later referred to as knowledge *in speculo Trinitatis*. In the later Middle Ages the doctrine became a topic of heated debate, with lines of opposition forming between the Thomists who, in general, advocated this doctrine, and Duns Scotus, William of Ockham, and others of a more voluntarist persuasion who firmly rejected it. By the seventeenth century the doctrine had become firmly linked to the Thomist school and was a prominent doctrinal strategy to justify prayer to the saints. As such it became a frequent polemical target of Reformed theologians of the period. See also Walaeus's *Loci Communes* on 'The True Worship of God' (*Opera* 1:258).

4 This refers to the distinction the Reformed scholastics made between necessity and contingency which depends on God's will *ad extra* derived from different objects. If the objects of divine knowledge were structurally antecedent to God's will this would imply that the com-

Matt. 18, 10. *ignorant tamen diem judicii*, Marc. 13, 32. et *imperiis ac potestatibus quae in coelis sunt,* πολυποίκιλος *illa Dei sapientia per Ecclesiam innotescit*, Eph. 3, 10. et *nemo neque in coelo, neque in terra, neque subter terram potuit aperire librum* (divinae scilicet providentiae circa Ecclesiam) *neque eum inspicere, nisi victor ille Leo de tribu Judae et stirps Davidis*, Apoc. 5, 5.

VII Quod vero alii excipiunt, haec iis revelari per Angelos, aut fideles hinc in coelum decedentes, cum ipsorum hypothesi non convenit. Quia fideles hinc discedentes igni purgatorio, extra conspectum Dei, ad tempus includunt. Deinde, nec Angeli, nec fideles morientes internas nostras necessitates norunt, cum καρδιογνῶσται non sint, nec nos Angelis aut sanctis decedentibus, vel illi nobis semper adsunt; quandoquidem et hi propriae salutis circa exitum suum ipsi satagunt, atque illi in proprio suo domicilio, nempe coelo, plerumque commorantur, Gen. 28, 12. Luc. 1, 19. etc.

VIII Nec magis eos juvat quod postremo comminiscuntur, Deum necessitates ac preces fidelium sanctis in coelo revelare, ac commendare, ut ipsi deinde eas revelent ac commendent Deo. Nam et extra Scripturam ambages hoc sine ulla necessitate nectit; cum nobis idem accessus ad Deum in Christo pateat, qui fidelibus, antequam ulli sancti in coelum essent recepti, semper patuit; et invicte ex iis Sacrae Scripturae locis id refutatur, qui hanc singularium rerum* hujus vitae cognitionem defunctis adimunt, quemadmodum videre est, Hiob. 14, 21. Eccl. 9, 7. 2 Reg. 22, 20. Esa. 64, 2. etc.

IX Haec cum ita se habeant, consequitur, Pontificios non tantum contra Dei mandata et omnium Sanctorum exempla, Angelos et defunctos invocare; sed manifestam quoque idololatriam committere, iisdem in invocatione sua tribuentes, quae Deus sibi soli servare voluit.

X Nec ab Idololatria eos excusat frivola inter λατρείαν ac δουλείαν distinctio, quandoquidem Sacra Scriptura, Gentilium ac Judaeorum idololatriam non minus voce* δουλείας, quam λατρείας exprimit, quemadmodum videre est Gal. 4, 8. Imo si discrimen inter voces* illas sit statuendum, majoris subjectionis est

---

munication of these objects would be a necessary act for God and not his free decision. God's knowledge *ad intra* is a natural and necessary knowledge. For the fundamental importance of this distinction see *SPT* 6.32–37.

(Matthew 18:10) still "do not know the day of judgment" (Mark 13:32); "and to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places the manifold wisdom of God is made known through the church" (Ephesians 3:10), and "no-one in heaven or on earth or under the earth was able to open the book (that is, the book of God's providence concerning the church) nor to look into it, except the victorious Lion of the tribe of Judah and the root of David" (Revelation 5:5).

7 The argument that others bring forward, that these things are revealed through angels or through believers who have departed from this world into heaven, does not match their hypothesis.[5] For they confine deceased believers to the fires of Purgatory for a period of time, away from the sight of God. Secondly, neither angels nor dying believers know our inward needs, since they are not 'knowers of the heart;'[6] nor are we always in the presence of the angels or the departing saints, nor they with us. For following their death, these saints are occupied with their own salvation, while the angels for the most part spend their time in their own abode, that is, heaven (Genesis 28:12; Luke 1:19, etc.).

8 Nor are they helped any further by this last thing that they fabricate: that God reveals and commends the needs and prayers of believers to the saints in heaven so that they in turn reveal and commend them to God. For there is no need whatsoever for this detour circumventing Scripture; for the access to God in Christ that lies open for us is the same as the one that was always available to believers before any saints were received into heaven. And this is invincibly refuted by those places in Holy Scripture wherein the ones who have died are deprived of this knowledge of particular things* of this life, as can be seen from Job 14:21, Ecclesiastes 9:2, 2 Kings 22:20, Isaiah 64:2,[7] etc.

9 This being the case, it follows that when they call upon angels or the deceased, the papal teachers not only contradict the commandments of God and the examples of all the saints, but also they commit blatant idolatry when in their prayers they ascribe to them things that God willed to keep for himself alone.

10 And also the little difference in meaning between *latreia* ('due service') and *douleia* ('bondage') does not excuse them from the charge of idolatry, because Holy Scripture conveys the idolatry of the gentile and Jewish peoples no less with the word* *douleia* than *latreia*, as can be seen in Galatians 4:8.[8] Indeed, if we must make a distinction between those two terms,* then it would be one of

5 It is not clear to whom Walaeus is referring here.

6 For *kardiognōstēs* see Acts 1:24 and 15:8.

7 Probably the reference is to Isaiah 63:16 or 64:6.

8 For *latreia* and *douleia* see also the discussion of idolatry in *SPT* 19.7–9.

δουλεύειν quam λατρεύειν, cum illud de quibusvis ministrantibus, hoc vero de servientibus proprie* usurpetur.

XI Multo minus haec vocum* distinctio, rei* ipsius distinctionem infert. Nam praeterquam quod manifesto, quicquid excusent, hac invocatione sua creaturis divinas proprietates tribuant; etiam huc accedit, quod pleraeque ipsorum preces ad Sanctos iis verbis* sint conceptae, et eo affectu* pronuncientur, quibus Sacra Scriptura ipsum Deum in precibus compellandum docet: quemadmodum ex ipsorum Hortulo animae et Psalterio Mariae, e Psalterio Davidis fere ad verbum expresso, inter cetera manifestum est.

XII Quum Deum solum invocandum hic dicimus, consideramus eum non tantum communiter et essentialiter,* sed etiam personaliter,* et licet Sacra Scriptura in invocatione nomen Patris frequentius proponat, quia reliquae personae* ei originem suam debent, et quia in opere redemptionis nostrae primum locum servat; tamen et reliquas personas distincte invocari posse, Scripturae loca et exempla evincunt.

XIII Quum enim Pater inducit unigenitum suum in orbem terrarum, praeceptum de eo promulgat, *Et adorent eum omnes Angeli Dei*, sicuti ex Psal. 65, 6. testatur Apostolus Heb. 1, 6. Imo *ideo accepit nomen super omne nomen* (etiam qua Mediator) *ut in nomen Jesu omne genu se flectat*, Philip. 2, 10. Unde et Ecclesia Christi universe, et Apostoli sigillatim, ejus quoque nomen saepius distincte invocant, ut videre est Act. 9, 14. 1 Cor. 1, 2. Rom. 1, 7. 2 Cor. 1, 2. Gal. 1, 3. etc. 2 Joh. 1, 3. Apoc. 1, 5. etc.

increased submission in *douleuein* compared to *latreuein*, since the latter term is used for any and all who provide a service, while the first is properly* used of slaves.

This difference in the words'* meaning introduces a much smaller distinc- 11
tion in the actual matter.* For besides the fact that it is obvious (however much they explain it away) how in this invocation of theirs they ascribe divine properties to created beings, there is the additional element that very many of their prayers to the saints are conceived and pronounced with the same words* (and the same sentiments*) that Holy Scripture teaches should be used in our prayers when we beseech God. This is clear from the expressions in, among others, their 'Little Garden of the Soul'[9] and the 'Marian Psalter' that are taken nearly verbatim from the Psalter of David.[10]

When we state on this point that we should call upon God alone, then we are 12
thinking of God not just in a general sense and in his essence,* but also according to the [divine] persons.* And although Holy Scripture more frequently puts forward the name of the Father in invocations, because the other persons* owe their origins to him, and because in the work of our redemption he occupies the primary position, even so there are passages and examples from Scripture that demonstrate that it is possible to call upon the other persons individually, too.

For when the Father brings his only-begotten Son into the world, He pro- 13
claims this order about him: "And let all the angels of God worship him," as the apostle in Hebrews 1:6 testifies from Psalm 65:6.[11] Indeed, "therefore he has received the name above every name (even as the Mediator) that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow" (Philippians 2:10).[12] And for this reason also Christ's Church throughout the world, and the individual apostles, very often call upon his name in particular, as can be seen from Acts 9:14, 1 Corinthians 1:2, Romans 1:7, 2 Corinthians 1:2, Galatians 1:3 (etc.), 2 John 1:3, Revelation 1:5, etc.

---

9 The *Hortulus Animae* was a popular prayer book in the sixteenth century; it was translated into Dutch and reprinted numerous times.

10 The *Psalterium Mariae* developed from 150 antiphons about Mary prefacing the Davidic Psalms into independent stanzas. See further Lorenzo F. Candelaria, *The Rosary Cantoral: Ritual and Social Design in a Chantbook from Early Renaissance Toledo* (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2008), 70. The texts resemble those of the Psalms.

11 This apparently should be Psalm 97:7.

12 Later it became a matter of debate among the Reformed orthodox whether Christ can be worshipped according to both natures, because of his mediatorship, or merely according to his divine nature. Elaborating on the effects of the hypostatic union, Walaeus in his *Loci* takes the former position (*Opera* 1:389–390). For a summary of the discussion and some sources see Bavinck, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 3:318.

XIV Spiritum quoque Sanctum distincte invocari posse, non tantum proprietates omnes, quae in vera invocatione supra a nobis requisitae sunt, demonstrant;* sed etiam Apostolorum atque Ecclesiae primae exemplum, ut 2 Cor. 13, 13. Apoc. 1, 4. Item Act. 4, 24. si conferatur cum Hebr. 3, 7. et Act. 28, 25. si conferatur cum Esa. 6, 3. etc.

XV *Secundum*, quod nobis initio hic explicandum sumsimus, est, *per quem* haec invocatio institui debeat. Quia enim Deus ignis consumens est, et oculi ejus tam puri sunt ut injustitiam intueri non possint. Hab. 1, 13. consequitur, hominibus infirmis ac peccatoribus mediatorem esse quaerendum, per quem ipsis aditus ad gratiae thronum patefiat, Hebr. 4, 14. etc.

XVI Hunc mediatorem, nec inter Angelos, ut olim Platonici contenderunt, nec inter Sanctos defunctos, ut quondam Antidicomaritae, et utrosque imitati Pontificii opinantur, quaerendum sentimus, quia nulli Angelorum, aut Sanctorum in coelis receptorum, ejusmodi proprietates conveniunt, quales in hac Mediatione requiruntur.

All the properties that we stated above as required for genuine invocation show that also the Holy Spirit can be called upon individually. This is shown* moreover by the example of the apostles and the first church, as in 2 Corinthians 13:13, Revelation 1:4, and likewise in Acts 4:24 when compared with Hebrews 3:7 and Acts 28:25 in comparison with Isaiah 6:3, etc.[13] 14

The second question that we undertook at the beginning to answer is: by whom ought this prayer to be made. For since God is a consuming fire and his eyes are so pure that they cannot stand to look upon iniquity (Habakkuk 1:13), it follows that weak and sinful people must seek a mediator through whom the access to the throne of grace is opened (Hebrews 4:14, etc.). 15

We think that this mediator should not be sought among angels (as the Platonists once contended)[14] or among deceased saints (as formerly the Antidicomarianites[15] thought, and now the papal teachers who follow them think), because the sort of properties that are required in this mediation do not belong to any one of the angels or the saints who have been received into heaven. 16

13 In Acts 4:24 the congregation prays to the Lord who has made heaven, earth, and sea, a reference to Psalm 95, while Hebrews 3:7 ascribes that Psalm to the Holy Spirit; therefore, according to Walaeus, prayer to the Holy Spirit is allowed. Acts 28:25 states that the Holy Spirit has spoken to Isaiah in chapter 6 and in that same chapter Isaiah asks if he may be sent (probably verse 6:9 is meant), therefore it is allowed to ask the Holy Spirit something.

14 For a Reformed reference to Plato as a source for angelic intercession see Calvin, *Institutes* 1.14.12, *Commentary on John* 5:4 (*CO* 47:105–106) and *Commentary on Colossians* 2:18 (*CO* 52:112); the reference to angels, however, does not seem to be appropriate. Charles Partee, *Calvin and Classical Philosophy* (Leiden: Brill, 1977), 50. Plato does describe how those who have committed crimes call upon their victims in the afterlife from a place where they are being purified of their sins (*Phaedo* 113–114).

15 The Antidicomarians or Antidicomarianites from the third and fourth centuries opposed the doctrine of the perpetual virginity of Mary. The reference might be to remarks by Epiphanius of Salamis (315–403) who in *Panarion* discusses the heresies of both the Antidicomarians and the Collyridians, who went to the other extreme by worshipping Mary and by letting priestesses sacrifice to her. In that context he emphasizes the difference between God, who alone is to be worshipped, and Mary, and he expressly states that saints are not to be worshipped. See Epiphanius, *Panarion* 78.23 and 79.4–5. See further Frank Williams (ed.), *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis / Book II and III* (*Sects 47–80*, De Fide) (Leiden: Brill 1994), 634–635 and 640–641. For a similar reference to the Antidicomarians by a Lutheran theologian see Beth Kreitzer, *Reforming Mary: Changing Images of the Virgin Mary in Lutheran Sermons of the Sixteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 34. She refers to Nikolaus Selnecker, *Epistolarum et evangeliorum dispositio, quae in diebus festis b. Mariae semper virginis et s. apostolorum in ecclesia proponuntur* (Frankfurt: Moenus, 1575), 75.

XVII Nam nec Angeli, nec Sancti defuncti ad hanc muneris Sacerdotalis partem a Deo sunt electi, *cum tamen nemo sibi sumat hunc honorem, nisi qui vocatur a Deo, sicuti Aaron*, Hebr. 5, 4. nec meritis ac morte sua Dei iram placare, aut aditum nobis ad thronum gratiae aperire possunt,* qui ipsi non nisi divinae misericordiae et Christi mediationi salutem suam debent, Col. 1, 20. nec nobiscum per omnia ὁμοιοπαθεῖς, omnium nostrum necessitates cognoscere, aut earum sensu affici possunt,* qui ne liberorum quidem suorum sibi superstitum statu afficiuntur, Hiob. 14, 21. nec suorum subditorum ac familiarium mala vident, 2 Reg. 22, 20.

XVIII Christus vero solus is est, de quo Pater juravit, *Tu es Sacerdos in aeternum secundum ordinem Melchisedech, etc. unde et* εἰς τὸ παντελὲς, *perfecte servare potest eos, qui per ipsum accedunt ad Deum*, Heb. 7, 25. et qui per meritum et efficaciam mortis suae *nobis aperuit viam recentem ac vivam, et libertatem ingrediendi coeleste sacrarium*, Hebr. 10, 19. et qui denique *per omnia nobiscum similiter tentatus absque peccato*, sufficienter *affici potest nostrarum infirmitatum sensu*, Hebr. 4, 15.

XIX Unde Sacra Scriptura de nullo alio quam de Christo testatur, quod *pro nobis ad dextram Patris interpellet*, Rom. 8, 34. et quod *in ipsum coelum tamquam Pontifex noster ingressus sit, ut appareat nunc in conspectu Dei pro nobis*, Hebr. 9, 24. et quod *habeamus eum justum advocatum apud Patrem*, 1Joh. 2, 1. et ipse Christus de sese solo asserit: *Ego sum via, veritas et vita, nemo venit ad Patrem nisi per me*, Joh. 14, 6. atque iterum v. 13. *quidquid petieritis in nomine meo, hoc faciam, ut glorificetur Pater in Filio*, etc. c. 16. v. 23. *Amen, Amen, dico vobis, quaecunque petieritis a Patre meo, in nomine meo, dabit vobis*.

XX Haec tamen omnia non impediunt, quominus animae beatorum in coelis, juxta cum ipsis Angelis, adventum regni Jesu Christi perpetuis votis exoptent, et Ecclesiae hic militantis liberationem expetant, sicuti ejus rei exemplum proponitur Apoc. 5, 8. et 6, 10. et quominus fideles in terra viventes non tantum pro se, sed et pro fratribus suis, eorumque necessitatibus Deum per unicum Mediatorem Christum unanimiter interpellent, quia conservi sunt sub eodem domino, et membra ejusdem corporis sub eodem capite, qui studio divinae gloriae, et caritatis communis* lege, pro ratione conditionis et notitiae ipsorum,

For neither angels nor deceased saints were chosen by God for this part of 17
the priestly office, "since no-one takes this honor upon himself, but only he who is called by God, as was Aaron" (Hebrews 5:4). Nor are they able* to appease God's wrath by their own merits and death, or to open for us the access to the throne of grace,* as they owe their salvation to nothing other than God's mercy and Christ's mediation (Colossians 1:20). And not being in all things of like nature with us,[16] they cannot* know all our needs, or be touched by them in their feelings, as they are not affected by the circumstances of even their own surviving children (Job 14:21), nor do they see the evils that befall their subjects, or their own household (2 Kings 22:20).

But it is only of Christ that the Father swore: "You are a priest forever after 18
the order of Melchizedek, etc.," and therefore He is able to the utmost "to save perfectly those who draw near to God through him" (Hebrews 7:25). And it is He who through the merit and efficacy of his death "has opened for us a new and living way, and freedom to enter into the heavenly sanctuary" (Hebrews 10:19). Lastly, it is He who in every respect has been tempted as we are, yet without sin, who can sufficiently be touched with the feelings of our weaknesses (Hebrews 4:15).

Therefore Holy Scripture testifies about no-one else but Christ that he is 19
interceding on our behalf at the right hand of the Father (Romans 8:34), and because "as our high priest he has entered into heaven itself now to appear in the presence of God on our behalf" (Hebrews 9:24) and because "in him we have a just advocate with the Father" (1 John 2:1). Even Christ himself asserts about himself alone that "I am the way, the truth, and the life, no-one comes to the Father but through me" (John 14:6); and again: "whatever you ask of the Father in my name I shall do it, so that the Father may be glorified in the Son" (John 14:13, etc.), and: "Truly, truly I say to you, whatever you ask from my Father in my name, he will give it to you" (John 16:23).

All these things do not, however, prevent the souls of the blessed who are in 20
heaven in the company of the angels themselves from yearning for the coming of the kingdom of Jesus Christ with constant prayer, and from seeking the deliverance of the militant church here on earth, as is seen from the illustration of it in Revelation 5:8 and 6:10. And like the believers living on the earth, they solicit God with one accord through the only Mediator Jesus Christ not only for themselves but also for their brothers and their needs, because they are fellow-servants of one and the same master, and members of the same body under the same head. In their eagerness for God's glory and the law of common* love, they have been restricted by God, in keeping with their state and knowledge,

16 The Greek word used here, *homoiopathēs*, occurs in Acts 14:15 and in James 5:17.

ad haec officia invicem praestanda divinitus sunt obstricti; sicuti ejus rei exempla et mandata plurima in Scripturis occurrunt.

XXI Explicatis duobus primis membris, sequitur jam Tertium, nempe, quomodo haec invocatio institui debeat, ut oratio nostra Deo sit grata, et nobis salutaris ac fructuosa.

XXII *Ad modum** hunc referimus, tam *formam et constitutionem* legitimam precum ac precantium *internam*; quam *formam et constitutionem* eorundem *externam*.

XXIII Ad *constitutionem* precum ac precantium *internam* ante omnia necessaria est, vera ac sincera hominis precaturi *Resipiscentia*, non tantum generalis illa et prima, sed et specialis ab admissis peccatis. Quemadmodum enim Scriptura testatur, *Deum peccatores non audire*, Joh. 9, 31. et multos *petere ac non accipere, eo quod male petant, ut in voluptates suas absumant*:[a] ita et monet populum suum, ut *amoveat malignitatem actionum suarum*, si orationem suam exaudiri velit, Esa. 1, 16. et Apostolus Joannes 1 Epist. cap. 3, 21. asserit, *Si cor nostrum nos non condemnet, fiduciam habemus apud Deum, et quicquid petierimus, accipiemus ab eo, quoniam praecepta ejus custodimus, et ea quae ipsi placent, facimus*.

XXIV Speciatim vero Sacra Scriptura hic nobis commendat reconciliationem cum fratribus, et condonationem sinceram earum offensarum, quae adversus nos sunt commissae, sicuti Christus generatim praecipit, Matt. 5, 23. et speciatim in precatione remissionis peccatorum, Matt. 6, 12. atque latissime in parabola duorum debitorum, Matt. 18, 23. et deinceps.

XXV Alterum in precibus necessarium, est vera precantis *humilitas conjuncta cum reverentia filiali*, ex consideratione conditionis nostrae, et Majestatis ac benignitatis ejus, quem in precibus nostris compellamus, sicuti id liquet non tantum exemplis Sanctorum, Abrahami, Gen. 18. Davidis, 2 Sam. 7. Danielis, Dan. 9. etc. sed ex professo a Christo quoque docetur, Luc. 18, 14. in Parabola Pharisaei et publicani, cum hoc epiphonemate, *Quicunque se extollit, deprimetur, et qui se deprimit, extolletur*. Unde et Apostolus Petrus, 1 Pet. 5, 5. testatur, *Deum superbis resistere, humilibus autem dare gratiam*. Et Christus idcirco preces nostras sic instituendas monet, ut cogitemus, eum quem invocamus, esse *Patrem nostrum qui est in coelis, cui est Regnum, et potentia, et gloria*, Matt. 6, 9. et 13. 15.

---

[a] Iac. 4.3: Walaeus, *Opera* 1:105b.

to fulfilling these reciprocal duties, as is shown by the very many instances and commandments of it that one meets in Scripture.

After this explanation of the first two elements, the third one now follows: 21
in what way this invocation should be made so that our prayer may be pleasing to God and salutary and fruitful for us.

To this mode* we relate the legitimate inward form and disposition of the 22
prayers and the people praying, and also their outward form and disposition.

A true and genuine sense of repentance in the one who is going to pray 23
is required before all else for the internal disposition of the prayers and the one praying. And this is not just that general and first repentance, but that particular repentance from sins that have been committed.[17] And it is just as Scripture testifies: "God does not heed sinners" (John 9:31), and many "ask but do not receive because they ask wrongly, so that they may spend it on their own pleasures" [James 4:3]. And so [God] warns his people to "put away the evil of their own doings," if it wishes its prayer to be heard (Isaiah 1:16), and the apostle John asserts: "If our heart does not condemn us, we have confidence toward God, and whatsoever we ask, we receive of him because we keep his commandments and do what is pleasing to him" (1John 3:21 [and 22]).

On this point Holy Scripture advises us especially to be reconciled with our 24
brothers, and to forgive from the heart those wrongdoings which have been committed against us, as Christ instructed both generally (Matthew 5:23) and specifically in the prayer for the forgiveness of sins (Matthew 6:12), and most broadly in the parable of two debtors (Matthew 18:23 and following).

The second element necessary in prayer is "true humility accompanied by 25
child-like reverence" in the one who is praying, in view of both our own state and the majesty and kindness of the one we are beseeching in our prayers, as is clear from the examples of the saints Abraham (Genesis 18), David (2Samuel 7), Daniel (Daniel 9), etc. It is clear also from what Christ expressly teaches in the parable of the Pharisee and the tax-collector with this exclamation:[18] "Everyone who exalts himself will be humbled, and he who humbles himself will be exalted" (Luke 18:14). And so also the apostle Peter testifies that "God resists the proud but gives grace to the humble" (1Peter 5:5). And therefore Christ warns us to so make our prayers that we consider the fact that the one whom we are calling upon is "our Father, who is in heaven, and to whom belongs the kingdom and the power and the glory" (Matthew 6:9, 13 and 15).

---

17 On the distinction between the first repentance and continual repentance see *SPT* 32.1, note 2 and 32.48.

18 The rhetorical term *epiphonema* (a Greek loan-word) is a striking proverbial or summary statement used to conclude a discourse.

XXVI Tertium quod hic requiritur, est *vera fides*, qua non tantum generatim in Deum et Christum Mediatorem credimus; *quomodo enim invocabunt eum in quem non credunt?* Rom. 10, 14. sed etiam *firmam fiduciam* in eodem locamus, nos illud ipsum esse impetraturos, quod secundum ipsius voluntatem* petimus. Nam qui hanc fiduciam non habet, Dei promissionibus diffidit, quae hic multae et perspicuae sunt. Atque ideo Jacobus Apostolus monet, cap. 1. vers. 5. *Si cui vestrum deest sapientia, postulet a Deo, qui dat omnibus benigne*, etc. *sed postulet cum fide nihil disceptans*, etc. et Christus ipse multo etiam clarius, Marc. 11, 24. *Propterea dico vobis, quaecunque precantes petitis, credite vos accepturos, et erunt vobis*.

XXVII Denique requiritur intentio sincera cordis nostri, non tantum in eum quem invocamus, et in eum per quem invocamus, quod ex antecedentibus patet, sed etiam *desiderium ardens ex sensu indigentiae nostrae, et intentio constans in rem* illam, quam secundum Dei voluntatem* postulamus*. Ideo Propheta David non tantum testatur se animam suam ad Jehovam attollere, Psal. 25, 1. et passim alibi; sed etiam ex profunditatibus se inclamare Jehovam, Psal. 130, 1. et mediationem suam coram eo effundere, atque angustiam suam coram eo indicare, Psal. 142, 2. etc. atque ideo Psal. 141, 2. comparat orationem muneri vespertino, et suffitui; qui licet a ventis nonnunquam transversum agatur, tamen in coelum tandem attollitur, et Psal. 123, 2. *Ecce*, inquit, *ut oculi servorum spectant ad manum dominorum suorum, ut oculi ancillae ad manum herae suae, ita oculi nostri ad Jehovam Deum nostrum, donec gratiam fecerit nobis*.

XXVIII Et hic est Spiritus ille gratiae et deprecationum, quem Deus per Christum in novo foedere pollicetur, se effusurum super domum Davidis, et habitatores Jerusalem, ut ad ipsum respiciant quem transfixerunt, Zach. 12, 10. et Spiritus ille adoptionis per quem clamamus, Abba Pater, etc. quique interpellat pro nobis gemitibus inenarrabilibus, etc. et secundum Deum, Rom. 8, 15. et 27.

XXIX *Externus* invocationis *modus** partim in *sermone*,* partim in *gestibus* corporis, partim denique in quibusdam aliis *circumstantiis consistit*.

XXX *Sermo* externus* in privatis precibus absolute* necessarius non est; quum et sermo* internus, et soli cordis gemitus ad Deum saepe sufficiant, quemadmodum videre est in exemplo Mosis, Ex. 14, 15. Annae, 1 Sam. 1, 13. Nehemiae, Neh.

True faith is the third element required here,[19] and not merely the faith with 26
which we generally believe in God and Christ the Mediator—for "how shall they call on him in whom they do not believe?" (Romans 10:14). But we also "place firm confidence in him," that we shall receive the very thing we ask for in accordance with his will.* For whoever does not possess this confidence distrusts God's promises, which are both numerous and very clear on this point. And therefore the apostle James warns us: "If any of you lacks wisdom, let him ask God, who gives generously to all; but let him ask in faith, and without doubting" (James 1:5 [and 6]). And Christ himself warns us even much more clearly: "Therefore I say to you, whatever you ask for when you pray, believe that you will receive it and it will be yours" (Mark 11:24).

And the final requirement is a genuine endeavor of our heart, towards the 27
one whom we are calling upon, and the one through whom we call (as is clear from the preceding). But it is also a burning desire that arises from the awareness of our need, and a constant right attitude towards the very thing* that we are beseeching in accordance with God's will.* For this reason the prophet David testifies not only that he is lifting up his soul to Jehovah (Psalm 25:1, and many other places) but also that he is calling on Jehovah from the depths of sorrow (Psalm 130:1) and that he is pouring out his meditations before him and disclosing his own anxieties before him (Psalm 142:2, etc.). And therefore he likens his prayer to the evening offering and incense—which, though the winds often blow it away, in the end it will reach up to heaven (Psalm 141:2). And in Psalm 123:2 he states: "Behold, as the eyes of servants look to the hand of their masters, and as the eyes of a maidservant to the hand of her mistress, so our eyes look to Jehovah our God, until he grant us his grace."

And here is that Spirit of grace and supplication whom God through Christ in 28
the new covenant promises to pour out on the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, "that they may look upon him whom they have pierced" (Zechariah 12:10). And here is that "Spirit of adoption through whom we cry, 'Abba, Father,' etc." (Romans 8:15), and who intercedes on our behalf with groans that cannot be uttered, etc., and in harmony with God's will (Romans 8:27).

The external mode* of invocation exists partly in what we say,* partly in our 29
physical gestures, and finally, partly in some other circumstances.

Outward speech* is not absolutely* necessary for prayers that are private, 30
since also internal discourse* and merely the groans of the heart are sufficient for God, as can be seen from the example of Moses (Exodus 14:15), Anna

19 See *SPT* 31.6 for a definition of true faith.

1, 4. etc. Alioquin ad affectum* internum testandum et juvandum, frequentius externus sermo, et clamor quoque in magnis angustiis adhiberi solet, sicut plurima ejus rei exempla in Veteri et Novo Testamento occurrunt, et ipsius quoque Servatoris nostri, Hebr. 5, 7.

XXXI In publicis vero precibus, quae nobis cum pluribus communes* sunt, aut in quibus minister verbi Ecclesiae praeit, sermonem* externum ejus qui praeit, contra Anabaptistas; et a praeeunte ac reliquis intellectum, contra Pontificios, esse necessarium, omnino statuimus; quia alioquin in eandem orationem consensus certus esse non potest, quem Christus hic tamen expresse requirit, Matt. 18, 19. Nec auditor aut qui implet locum idiotae, ad ejusmodi precationem Amen dicere potest,* sicut Apostolus disertis verbis observat, 1 Cor. 14, 15. et 16.

XXXII In ipsa sermonis* forma sedulo vitanda est omnis vanitas, item tautologia et loquacitas, sicuti Christus monet, Matt. 6, 7. sub qua tamen tautologia omnis eorundem aut similium verborum* iteratio comprehendenda non est, si ea ex vehementi cordis affectu* erumpat, quum et Sancti nonnunquam in precibus suis hanc admittant, et ipse Christus in maximis angoribus suis, Matt. 26, 39. et 42. et in cruce pendens, Matt. 27, 46. sed per eam intelligenda est Battologia non necessaria, et superstitiosa, atque ad certos numeros revocata earundem precationum repetitio: quemadmodum inter Gentiles olim obtinuit, atque inter Pontificios hodieque obtinet. Quod et Christus in Pharisaeis et Scribis reprehendit, qui in speciem utentes longis precibus devorabant domos viduarum, Matt. 23, 14. Luc. 20, 47.

XXXIII Quaeri hic solet, utrum conceptis precationum formulis, publice aut privatim uti liceat. Nos, si modo cum debita animi attentione pronuncientur, non tantum licitas, sed et valde utiles esse contendimus; quia novas κατὰ τὸ πρέπον concipere cuivis Christiano datum non est, et attentio auditorum in magnis

(1Samuel 1:13), Nehemiah (Nehemiah 1:4), etc. In other respects it is customary to use outward speech more frequently as witness and aid to internal feelings*—even wailing when in great difficulties, like the very many instances of it in the Old and New Testament, even of our Savior (Hebrews 5:7).

We do hold that for public prayers which we share* with many other people 31
or in which the minister of the Word leads the church it is altogether necessary that the speech* of the one leading in prayer be outward (contrary to the Anabaptists)[20] and that it be understood by the one leading as well as the others (contrary to the papal teachers).[21] For if not, people could not possibly* be of one and the same mind towards the same prayer—something that Christ expressly requires on this point (Matthew 18:19). And then neither the hearer nor he who occupies the place of the uninformed can say 'Amen' to that sort of prayer, as the apostle notes in very clear terms (1Corinthians 14:15–16).

We must studiously avoid all vanity in the very form of speaking, and also 32
all repetitions and verbosity, as Christ warns (Matthew 6:7), although with that repetition we should not understand the reiteration of the same or similar words* if that happens to break out from the distraught feelings* of the heart, since even the saints on occasion permit such reiteration in their prayers, including also Christ himself when he was greatly troubled (Matthew 26:39 and 42), and when he was hanging upon the cross (Matthew 27:46). But what we should understand by that kind of repetition are the vain and empty repetitions[22] that are unnecessary and superstitious, and the rehearsing of the same prayers that are repeated up to a specific number; this was prevalent among the gentiles of former times, and it is prevalent today among the papal teachers. Christ criticizes this practice in the Pharisees and scribes, who under pretense of making long prayers were devouring widows' houses (Matthew 23:14; Luke 20:47).

At this point the question often arises whether it is permitted in prayers 33
that are public or private to use previously composed sets of words. It is our contention that so long as they are spoken from the heart with due intent, the formulae are not only lawful but very useful. For it has not been granted to each and every Christian to compose fresh sets of words that are suitable, and in

20 Among the Dutch Anabaptists prayer in the worship services originally was silent. The more progressive Waterlanders were the first to switch to an audible prayer, but in Leiden, for instance, the silent prayer was practiced until 1672. See Samme Zijlstra, *Om de ware gemeente en de oude gronden: Geschiedenis van de dopersen in de Nederlanden, 1531–1675* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2000), 442.

21 This is against the Roman Catholic practice of saying the liturgy in Latin.

22 In the use of *battologia* ('vain repetition') there is an allusion to Matthew 6:7.

conventibus per usitatas formulas non parum juvatur. Unde et Deus ipse benedictionum formam Sacerdotibus in Veteri Testamento praescripsit, Num. 6, 24. et sequentibus. Imo Christus in cruce pendens deprecationis forma a Davide tamquam typo antea observata usus est, Matt. 27, 46. et discipuli Christi, Luc. 11, 2. rogaverunt Christum, ut doceret ipsos precari, prout Johannes docuerat discipulos suos; quibus a Christo responsum est, *Quum precamini, dicite, Pater noster qui es in coelis*, etc. Ex quibus verborum circumstantiis manifestum est, precationem hanc Christi, non esse tantum recte precandi normam, sed insuper quoque rite precandi formam; sicuti quoque tota vetusta Ecclesia id semper extra controversiam habuit.

XXXIV Interim tamen fatemur, valde esse utile, imo et pene necessarium, ut omnes fideles provectiores, et imprimis Ecclesiarum Pastores, donum aperte precandi, etiam sine praeviis formulis, in se exsuscitent; ut pro occasionibus oblatis, et necessitatibus ingruentibus, precationes ac gratiarum actiones possint instituere. Quemadmodum viros sanctos, item Prophetas et Apostolos in Veteri et Novo Testamento frequenter fecisse legimus; quod observata methodo, qua iidem in precibus suis utuntur, et accedente debita exercitatione difficile non erit.

XXXV *Gestus* in Sanctorum precibus varius observari potest. Moses in faciem suam procidit, Deut. 9, 18. David humi prostratus et amictus cilicio pro infante suo deprecatus est, 2 Sam. 12, 16. Hiobus sedens in cinere et pulvere, Hiob. 42, 6. Israëlitae stantes, Neh. 9, 5. Esra et Paulus flexus[a] in genua, Esr. 9, 5. et Act. 20, 36. Salomo flexis genibus, et expansis manibus, 2 Chron. 6, 13. Christus sublatis in coelum oculis, Joh. 17, 1. Publicanus vero in terram demissis, Luc. 18, 13. Vir aperto capite, femina vero tecto, ex praecepto Apostoli, 1 Cor. 11, 4.

[a] flexi: 1642.

large gatherings the attention of the hearers is helped considerably by sets of words that are familiar to them. For this reason even God himself prescribed the form of blessings for the priests in the Old Testament (Numbers 6:24 and following). In fact when Christ was hanged on the cross he used the form of prayer that had been observed previously by David as type (Matthew 27:46). And Christ's disciples asked him to teach them how to pray (Luke 11:2), just as John had taught his disciples; and Christ responded to them: "When you pray, say: 'Our Father who is in heaven, etc.'" It is clear from the context of these words that Christ's prayer is not just the norm for correct prayer but moreover the correct form of praying. And the whole early church always considered this to be beyond debate.

Yet at the same time we acknowledge that it is very useful and almost even 34
necessary that all the more advanced believers, and especially the shepherds of the church, foster in themselves the gift of praying freely, even without a set of words that were made previously, so that they will be able to make prayers of supplication and thanksgiving that are fitting to the immediate situation and to needs that suddenly come up.[23] We read that holy men, and also the prophets and apostles, did this frequently in this way. It will not be difficult for us to do likewise, by observing the method that they employ in their prayers, and the required practice which this method involves.

One can observe a variety of physical bearing in the prayers of the saints. 35
Moses fell upon his face (Deuteronomy 9:18); David was stretched upon the ground and clothed in sackcloth[24] when he prayed for his infant son (2 Samuel 12:16). Job was seated in ashes and dust (Job 42:6); the Israelites were standing (Nehemiah 9:5); Ezra and Paul were kneeling down (Ezra 9:5 and Acts 20:36). Solomon prayed on bended knees and with hands outstretched (2 Chronicles 6:13); Christ with eyes lifted up towards heaven (John 17:1), while the tax-collector prayed with his eyes cast down to the earth (Luke 18:13). And while men pray with their heads uncovered, women do so with covered head, according to the apostle's instruction (1 Corinthians 11:4).[25]

---

23 According to Van Deursen the people in church generally preferred composed prayers, because they wanted them to be orderly and not too long. If the pastor prayed freely, he was expected to close with the Lord's Prayer; see Arie Theodorus van Deursen, *Bavianen en slijkgeuzen: Kerk en kerkvolk ten tijde van Maurits en Oldenbarnevelt*, 3rd ed. (Franeker: Van Wijnen, 1998), 173. The strong rejection of the use of composed prayers by some Dutch theologians of the so-called 'Further Reformation' who were influenced by Puritans is of later date.

24 For the meaning of the Latin term *cilicium* (literally 'hair shirt') see *SPT* 32.50, note 43.

25 The annotation on the verse in the Dutch *Statenvertaling*, of which Walaeus possibly was the author, states that the uncovering of the head at that time was a sign of power and

XXXVI Ex quibus omnibus inter se collatis liquet, libertatem quidem aliquam in gestuum variatione esse relictam; interim tamen ejusmodi gestus esse adhibendos, qui cum cujusque populi consuetudine optime conveniant, et qui internam animi attentionem juvent, non impediant; a quibus absit omnis vanitas, negligentia et arrogantia, et qui internam orantium constitutionem et ardens desiderium sine affectatione commodissime exprimant: genuflexio tamen frequentissime a Sanctis fuit usurpata, unde et illa absolute* pro precatione quandoque sumitur, ut videre est Rom. 11, 4. et 14, 11. Item Eph. 3, 14. sicut et manuum expansio seu elevatio, cum praecepto in omni loco precandi conjungitur ab Apostolo, 1 Tim. 2, 8.

XXXVII *Circumstantiae*, ad quas in precibus quoque attendendum, *sunt locus et tempus*.

XXXVIII *Locus* sub Veteris Testamenti paedagogia omnis quidem fuit concessus, nam Jacob et Ezechias in lecto suo, Hiob in cinere, Simson in aula Philistaeorum, et Jonas in ventre ceti fuerunt exauditi a Deo; interim tamen ad certa quaedam loca tamquam Sacramenta* divinae praesentiae fideles peculiariter quoque fuerunt obligati, tum ante legem latam, Gen. 4, 14. et 28, 16. et 35, 1. Ex. 3, 12. etc. tum post legem latam. Quae loca fuerunt vel ordinaria, nempe tabernaculum ac templum, versus quod Daniel etiam exul in precibus se convertit, cap. 6, 11. vel extraordinaria a Prophetis extra ordinem designata, ut videre est Jos. 8, 30. 1 Sam. 14, 36. 1 Reg. 18, 36. etc.

XXXIX In Novo autem Testamento, quemadmodum praedictum fuit a Propheta Malachia, cap. 1, 11. ita et Christus testatur, *horam venisse et nunc esse, quando neque in monte, neque Hierosolymis adorabitur Pater, sed veri Adoratores adorabunt eum in Spiritu et veritate*, Joh. 4, 23. atque ideo Apostolus vult, ut *viri attollentes puras manus absque ira et disceptatione precentur in quovis loco*, 1 Tim. 2, 8.

---

sovereignty, whereas today those who are in authority shall keep their heads covered and those who are subject to them shall uncover their heads: "But in this matter one must always regard the use in different times and countries and what is correct and builds up." For an English translation see Theodore Haak, *The Dutch Annotations upon the whole Bible* (London: Henry Hills, 1657).

A comparison of all these things with each other makes it clear that a certain 36
amount of freedom was given for various gestures, but that at the same time we should adopt the kind of postures that are best suited to every nation's own customs and that promote rather than hinder the attentiveness of our soul. We should avoid every form of vanity in those postures, but also carelessness and pride; and the gestures should convey, without pretense and in a most suitable manner, the inner disposition and ardent longing of those who are praying. Yet the saints most frequently employed the bending of the knees,[26] and so that gesture was sometimes used in the absolute* sense for the prayer itself, as one can see from Romans 11:4 and 14:11, and likewise in Ephesians 3:14. And in the same vein the apostle links the stretching forth or lifting up of hands to the injunction that they should pray everywhere (1 Timothy 2:8).

The circumstances to which we must also pay attention in prayers are loca- 37
tion and time.

As for location, during the time of upbringing that is the Old Testament, any 38
location was permitted [for prayer], for God did hear the prayer of Jacob and Hezekiah when they were upon their beds, and Job sitting upon the ash-heap, Samson in the temple-court of the Philistines, and Jonah from the belly of the whale. Yet at the same time believers were also restricted to certain specific locations as sanctuaries* of God's presence, both before and after the law was given (Genesis 4:14;[27] 28:16; and 35:1; Exodus 3:12, etc.). These were either locations according to regulation, like the tabernacle and the temple (to which also Daniel turned in his prayers from exile, in Daniel 6:11), or extraordinary ones, which the prophets designated apart from a regulation (Joshua 8:30; 1 Samuel 14:36; 1 Kings 18:36 etc.).

In the New Testament, however, as the prophet Malachi (1:11) had foretold 39
and as Christ testifies: "The hour was coming and now is, when the Father shall be adored neither upon the mountain, nor in Jerusalem; but the true worshipers will worship the Father in Spirit and in truth" (John 4:23 [and 24]), and therefore the apostle orders that "men lifting up holy hands without wrath and dissention to pray in every place" (1 Timothy 2:8).

---

26 In 1610 the consistory of Middelburg—where Walaeus served as a pastor from 1605 to 1619—admonished the people to humble themselves bodily during the public prayers by kneeling and folding their hands. Frederick Nagtglas, *De algemeene kerkeraad der Nederduitsch-Hervormde Gemeente te Middelburg van 1574–1860* (Middelburg: Altorffer, 1860), 116. According to Van Deursen that was rather common at the time (*Bavianen en slijkgeuzen*, 173).

27 The reference is not clear and might be to Genesis 4:26 or 22:14.

XL In privatis tamen precibus loca secreta, et ab arbitris remota, quaerenda esse monet Christus, Matt. 6, 6. tum ne videamur hominum conspectum ac laudem inde expetere, quod hypocritarum esse Christus ibidem asserit, tum ut attentio nostra eo minus interrumpatur: unde et Christus loca solitaria ad precandum elegit, ut videre est Matt. 14, 23. etc. sed in publicis ac communibus* precibus, aggregatio nostra relinquenda non est, ut Apostolus monet, Hebr. 10, 25. quum fidelium conventus et consensus a Christo hanc acceperit promissionem, *Ubi duo ex vobis consenserint in terra, quodcunque petierint, fiet eis a Patre meo qui in coelis est; ubi enim sunt duo vel tres coacti in nomine meo, illic sum in medio eorum*, Matt. 18, 19. et 20.

XLI Superstitiosae ergo omnino sunt peregrinationes illae Pontificiorum ad sepulcrum Domini, aut alia loca longinqua precandi causa institutae; quum Deus ex aequo preces fidelium ubique jam exaudiat, et hujusmodi homines contra caritatis praescripta seipsos periculis non necessariis exponant, eosque quorum cura iis singulariter commendata est, sub hoc praetextu injuste saepe deserant. Nec superstitione quoque caret eorum factum, qui ad preces privatas concipiendas templa et aedes sacras fidelium conventu vacuas, etsi alia secretiora loca iis exposita sint, consueverunt accedere; quandoquidem Christus hunc ritum expresse in hypocritis condemnat, loco antea citato, Matt. 6, 5. 6. etc.

XLII *Tempus* precationi conveniens, est quodvis momentum, quo fides, spes, caritas, et sensus indigentiae nostrae tam publicae quam privatae nos ad precandum monent; unde et Christus Luc. 18, 1. discipulis mandat, *ut semper orent, nec segnescant*, et Apostolus 1 Thess. 5, 17. ut *indesinenter orent*. Nec tamen ideo probandum veterum Euchetarum, aut quorundam hodiernorum Monachorum

Christ warns us that for praying privately we should seek out hidden places, 40
ones that are removed from on-lookers (Matthew 6:6), so that we do not appear to be longing for the close attention and praise of men (which, as Christ in the same passage clearly states is what hypocrites do), and moreover so that our own attentiveness thereby is less interrupted. It was for this reason that Christ selected lonely places to pray, as is seen from Matthew 14:23, etc. But in public and shared* prayers we should not neglect to gather together, as the apostle cautions in Hebrews 10:25, since it is to the assembly of believers and their oneness of heart that Christ gave this promise: "When two of you upon earth agree concerning anything they shall ask, it shall be done for them by my Father who is in heaven; for where two or three are gathered in my name, there I am in their midst" (Matthew 18:19–20).

For this reason those pilgrimages that the Roman Catholics undertake to 41
the tomb of our Lord[28] or to other, far-flung places for the sake of prayer are altogether superstitious, since God now gives equal hearing to the prayers of believers wherever they are. And this sort of people, contrary to the commandment of love, expose themselves to unnecessary dangers, and often, under the pretext [of going to pray] they unfairly let down those people whose care has been entrusted particularly to them. And there is also no superstition lacking to the actions of those who for the purpose of making private prayers made it their custom to visit churches and sacred buildings when empty of the gathering of believers, even though other more private places were available to them. This is superstitious because Christ explicitly condemns this religious practice among the hypocrites, in the passage cited earlier (Matthew 6:5–6, etc.).

The time suitable for prayer is any moment at all when faith, hope, love, and 42
our sense of need (public as well as private) remind us that we ought to pray. For this reason Christ, too, commands his disciples that "they should always pray and not lose hope" (Luke 18:1), and the apostle that "they should pray without ceasing" (1Thessalonians 5:17). And yet that is not a reason to commend the doings of the ancient Euchites[29] or some monks nowadays, who profess that

28 On post-Reformation debates regarding pilgrimage see F. Thomas Noonan, *The Road to Jerusalem: Pilgrimage and Travel in the Age of Discovery* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), 84–100.

29 Euchites (from *euchē*, prayer, hence "those who pray") or Messalinians formed a monastic movement in Mesopotamia that ultimately became heretical. They perceived prayer to be the monk's exclusive task and rejected any discipline of the church. For this reason, they were initially condemned by a synod in Constantinople (426), followed by the Council of Ephesus (431), which did so on the basic excerpts from their manual, *Asceticon*, which were cited in the works of Macarius. See Hubert R. Drobner, *The Fathers of the Church: A Comprehensive Introduction* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 2007), 370.

factum, qui totum vitae tempus cantillando et precando se transigere profitentur; quia precatio, opera reliqua caritatis erga Deum aut proximum, impedire non debet, sed illis inservire.

XLIII Interim vero et publicis precibus certos dies, et privatis certum diei tempus, ut negligentiae et infirmitati nostrae succurratur, esse destinandum, exemplo[a] Davidis, Ps. 55, 18. Danielis, cap. 6. 11. et Petri, Act. 10, 9. libenter agnoscimus; ita tamen, ut omnis superstitio hinc absit, ac κενοδοξία, aut scrupulus conscientiae, si forte necessitas, aut opera caritatis privatae vel publicae id interrumpi postulent, quum in hoc negotio nulla praecisa lex a Christo aut Apostolis sit tradita et soli cordis ad Deum gemitus earum locum supplere possint, sicuti Thesi 30. a nobis antea est ostensum, et Ecclesia Israëlitica in Babylonem traducta ostendit, Ps. 137.

XLIV Ultimum quod nobis explicandum restat, est *objectum circa quod* invocatio versatur, quod duplex est, vel *persona** pro qua oramus, vel *res** quam orando postulamus.

XLV *Personam** quod attinet, orandum nobis est non tantum pro nobis, aut iis qui ad nos pertinent, sed etiam pro quibusvis hominibus 1Tim. 2, 2. etiam pro inimicis et persecutoribus nostris, ut Stephanus exemplo suo praeivit, Actor. 7, 60. exceptis solum iis, qui peccato ad mortem, id est in Spiritum Sanctum, peccant, pro quibus orare prohibemur, 1Joh. 5, 16. Peculiariter tamen nobis in Scriptura hic commendantur Reges, et in eminentia constituti, 1Tim. 2, 2. Pastores et inspectores Ecclesiae, 1Thess. 5, 25. Hebr. 13, 18. etc. Ecclesia ipsa et omnes Sancti, Eph. 6, 18. Col. 1, 3. et 4, 12. etc. captivi et pro Christo cruci subjecti, Act. 12, 5. et Hebr. 13, 3. aegri et afflicti, Jac. 5, 14. Item fratres peccantes peccato non ad mortem, 1Joh. 5, 16.

XLVI Res invocationi objectae sunt divina beneficia, Dei gloriae vel hominum necessitati ac saluti servientia, eaque vel praeterita et accepta, vel futura et accipienda.

[a] ex exemplo: Walaeus, *Opera* 1:107b.

they spend their whole life-time chanting and praying. Prayer ought to be an aid and not a hindrance to the other works of love for God or the neighbor.

Meanwhile, we readily acknowledge that we should assign certain days for 43
public prayers,[30] and for private ones a certain time of the day, to assist us in our carelessness and weakness, as in the case of David (Psalm 55:18), Daniel (Daniel 6:11), and Peter (Acts 10:9). But it should be done in such a way that all superstition stays away, and vainglory,[31] or scruple of conscience if strong necessity or individual or public charitable deeds demand an interruption to prayer, since in this matter Christ or the apostles handed down no precise rule, and since even the groanings alone of the heart to God could take its place, as we have pointed out earlier in thesis 30, and as the exiled church of Israel in Babylon showed (Psalm 137).

The last that remains for us to explain is the object around which our prayer 44
should turn, and it is twofold: either the person* for whom we pray or the thing* for which we ask in our prayer.

As far as the person* is concerned, we should pray not only for ourselves or 45
those who are dear to us, but also for anyone at all (1Timothy 2:2)—even for our enemies and persecutors, as Stephen displayed in an exemplary way (Acts 7:60). The only exception is for those who sin against the Holy Spirit with the sin unto death; we are forbidden to pray for them (1John 5:16). But in particular it is recommended in Scripture that we pray for kings and those who are placed in prominent positions (1Timothy 2:2), shepherds and overseers of the church (1Thessalonians 5:25; Hebrews 13:3, etc.). Also commended for prayer is the church itself and all the saints, those who are imprisoned or subjected for the sake of Christ's cross (Acts 12:5; Hebrews 13:3), the sick and the oppressed (James 5:14). And we should pray for brothers who commit sins that do not lead unto death (1John 5:16).

The things for which we call upon God are the divine benefits offered [to us] 46
that serve God's glory or the needs and wellbeing of people; and that we have received in the past, or that we are to receive in the future.

---

30 The Synod of Dort decided that the ministers may petition the government to set aside days for public fasting and prayer in times of "war, pestilence, national calamities, severe persecution of the churches and other general difficulties" (*Church Order of Dort*, article 66). See also Richard R. DeRidder, ed., *The Church Orders of the Sixteenth Century Reformed Churches of the Netherlands Together with Their Social, Political, and Ecclesiastical Context* (Grand Rapids: Calvin Theological Seminary, 1987), 554.

31 The word here used, *kenodoksia*, is a biblical *hapax legomenon*, occurring in Philippians 2:3.

XLVII Pro beneficiis praeteritis et acceptis gratiae agendae Deo, secundum praeceptum Apostoli, Eph. 5, 20. *Gratias agite semper de omnibus, in nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi, Deo et Patri*; idque non tantum in rebus laetis ac gratis, sed etiam tristibus et adversis, quando Deo nos iis exercere aut probare visum fuerit, exemplo Hiobi, cap. 1, 21. et Apostolorum, Act. 5, 41.

XLVIII Oratio futurorum beneficiorum, sive ea sint communia sive particularia, est duorum generum; vel malorum quae nobis metuenda sunt, deprecatio, vel bonorum quae nobis speranda sunt, postulatio. Haec autem cum sint vel corporalia vel spiritualia, utraque rursum vel simpliciter ad salutem et Dei gloriam necessaria, vel tantum secundum quid,* nos posteriora cum conditione, priora absolute,* et sine conditione roganda statuimus.

XLIX Quaeritur hic, an bona nulla deprecari, mala nulla imprecari aut nobis aut aliis liceat? Respondemus, esse quaedam tum corporalia tum spiritualia bona, quae, quia supra vires suas viri sancti esse judicabant, nonnunquam modeste deprecati sunt, ut patet exemplo Mosis, Ex. 3. et Jeremiae, Jer. 1, aut quia etiam abusum metuebant; quomodo nimias divitias aeque atque paupertatem deprecabatur Sapiens, Prov. 30, 8. et 9.

L Imprecationum autem diversa exempla in Scripturis reperiuntur, tum qua Sancti diei nativitatis suae maledicunt propter ingruentium malorum gravitatem, Job. 3, 3. et Jer. 20, 14. sed haec potius ex infirmitate videntur profecta; tum qua ad innocentiam suam testandam, cum conditione, si hoc aut illud fecerint, a Deo poenam exoptant, cujusmodi multa exempla in historia sacra occurrunt; nunquam tamen a Satana aut inferno, ut Gentiles et Pontificiorum sacrificuli se diris devovere impie solent; tum denique ad testandum singulare suum studium et zelum erga Dei gloriam, et aliorum conservationem, cui propriam quandoque salutem postponunt, sicut videmus in Mose, Ex. 32, 32. et in Paulo, Rom. 9, 3.

LI Imprecationum vero in alios, diversa quoque sunt exempla, nempe vel adversus probos, vel adversus improbos; adversus probos, si monitionibus non cedant, ut per castigationem emendentur, quemadmodum hujus rei exemplum est Hiob. 34, 36. Adversus vero improbos, hostes Ecclesiae ac gloriae Dei, et inemendabiles, plurima imprecationum exempla non tantum in Vetere sed

It is by the apostle's injunction that we should give thanks to God for the benefits that we have received in the past: "Give thanks always for everything to God the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Ephesians 5:20). And we should do so not only in times of joy and gratitude, but also in sad and difficult times, whenever God decides to train or try us by them, as in the case of Job (chapter 1:21) and the apostles (Acts 5:41). 47

The prayer for future benefits, whether they are shared in common or individual, are of two kinds: the prayer to ward off those evils we should fear, or the prayer of supplication for the good things that we should hope for. These benefits are bodily or spiritual, and both are also either absolutely necessary for our salvation and the glory of God, or they are necessary for another reason.* Therefore we posit that the ones of this latter kind should be asked for conditionally, and as the former are absolute,* we should ask for them without condition. 48

Here the question arises, whether it is not permitted for us or other people to pray God to ward off anything good, or to invoke anything evil. We reply that there are certain bodily and spiritual goods which, because the holy men deemed them to be beyond their own capabilities, they sometimes humbly prayed to avoid them (as is clear from the examples of Moses in Exodus 3 and Jeremiah in Jeremiah 1), or because they feared that they might abuse them, in the way that the wise man prayed equally to ward off too many riches and poverty (Proverbs 30:8–9). 49

In the Scriptures various examples may be found of imprecations wherein the saints cursed the day that they were born because of the severity of the hardships that have come over them (Job 3:3 and Jeremiah 20:14)—but it rather seems that these prayers arose from their own frailty. Or these imprecations were made to declare their own innocence, and with the proviso that if they had committed one thing or another, they wish God to punish them. Of this sort of imprecation there are many examples in sacred history. But [they never called down curses] from Satan or hell, like the gentiles and the papal priests do, who are impiously accustomed to invoke curses upon themselves. And, lastly, the saints offered imprecations as a special testimony of their own eagerness and zeal for God's glory and the safe-keeping of other people, for whose sake they at some time put off even their own salvation, as we see in the case of Moses (Exodus 32:32) and Paul (Romans 9:3). 50

And there are also various examples of imprecations against other people, that is, against those who are upright, or against the unrighteous. Against the upright, to set them straight by chastising them if they do not heed warnings, as in the example of it in Job 34:36. There are very many examples, in both the Old and the New Testament, of imprecations against the unrighteous, the 51

et in Novo Testamento exstant, ut videre est 2 Tim. 4, 14. *Alexander faber aerarius multa mala mihi exhibuit, reddat ei Dominus secundum facta ipsius*. et Apoc. 6, 10. *Usque quo, Domine qui sanctus es et verax, non judicas ac vindicas sanguinem nostrum de iis qui habitant in terra?*

LII Sed haec fidelibus temere imitanda non sunt, nisi certa hujus hostilitatis pertinacis et inemendabilis appareant signa; alioquin admonitio Apostoli Jacobi, cap. 5, 9. semper in privatis offensis est observanda, *Ne alius adversus alium ingemiscite*, et Christi, Matt. 5, 44. *Benedicite iis qui devovent vos, benefacite iis qui oderunt vos, et precamini pro iis, qui vos infestant, et persequuntur vos, ut sitis filii Patris vestri qui est in coelis*. Cui sit gloria et benedictio in secula, Amen.

enemies of the Church and God's glory, as is seen in 2 Timothy 4:14: "Alexander the metalworker did me much harm; the Lord will repay him according to his deeds" and in Revelation 6:10: "How long, O Lord who art holy and true, do you not judge and avenge our blood on those who dwell upon the earth?"

But believers should not follow these examples rashly, unless the signs 52
of such stubborn and incorrigible hostility are very clear. And otherwise we should heed the warning of the apostle James, always in the case of private offenses "not to grumble against one another" (James 5:9). And the warning of Christ: "Bless those who curse you, and do good to those who hate you, and pray for them who treat you despitefully and persecute you, that you may be children of your Father who is in heaven" (Matthew 5:44 [and 45]). To him be the glory and the praise forever. Amen.

DISPUTATIO XXXVII

De Eleemosynis et Jejuniis

Praeside D. ANTONIO THYSIO
Respondente JOHANNE a WESTERBURGH

THESIS I Sicuti inter bona opera Precatio ad Deum effusa eminet, ut quae fidei insigne est munus, quamvis et ipsa, quatenus pro aliis funditur, caritatem erga proximum quoque respiciat: ita et *Eleemosyna* praeclarum caritatis erga proximum est specimen, quae cum *Jejunii exercitio* conjuncta, non exiguum pondus orationi affert, Matt. 6, 1. 5. 16. Act. 10, 2. 3. 4. De quibus in praesentia, cum Deo, agemus.

II ’Ελεημοσύνης vox,* a commiserando desumpta, *misericordiam* Latinis denotat, affectum* scilicet, quo aliorum miseria afficimur: quin et effectum avertendi malum a proximo, eumque juvandi comprehendit, ac pro omni ἀγαθοποιΐᾳ, beneficentia, usurpatur, ut sit misericordis affectionis benignitas, Jac. 3, 13.[a] specialiter autem pro stipe ac subsidio, quo pauperum indigentiae succurritur.

III Est autem Eleemosyna, *caritatis erga proximum actus,* quo vir pius, misericors, et alienae miseriae compatiens, benevolus et beneficus, vere pauperibus ac vitae hujus subsidiis indigentibus, ex bonis suis, pro facultatibus* ac illorum praesente necessitate, vera fide, et ardenti in Deum, et erga proximum amore, subvenit: sub spe divinae remunerationis adipiscendae.

[a] Probably James 3:17 is meant where the Vulgate translates μεστός ἐλέους (full of mercy) as *plena misericordia*.

DISPUTATION 37

On Almsgiving and Fasting

President: Antonius Thysius
Respondent: Johannes Westerburgh[1]

Among good works the outpouring of prayer to God stands out as an important duty of faith, although as far as it is poured out for other people, prayer also relates to the love towards our neighbor. In the same way, the giving of alms is an outstanding example of love for our neighbor, and when accompanied by the practice of fasting it adds no small weight to the words of prayer (Matthew 6:1, 5, 16; Acts 10:2, 3, 4). And with the help of God, in this disputation we shall undertake to treat these two. 1

The word* *eleēmosynē*, which comes from 'having compassion,' means 'mercy' in Latin; that is, the sense of affection* whereby the plight of other people touches us. But it also includes the effect of it: averting evil from our neighbor and helping him. The word is used for every 'act of kindness'[2] (*agathopoiia*), so that it is the gentleness of compassionate feeling (James 3:13), but especially for the support and aid that help the needs of the poor. 2

Almsgiving is an act* of charity towards the neighbor, whereby someone who is devout, merciful, and sympathetic to the misery of another, someone who is kind and beneficent, comes to the aid of those who are truly poor and need the supports of this life. He does so from his own goods and in proportion to his financial resources* and their current need, out of true faith and burning love for God and his neighbor, all in the hope of obtaining a divine reward.[3] 3

1 Born 1599 in Utrecht, Johannes a Westerburgh matriculated on June 26, 1619 in theology. He was ordained in Tienhoven (province of Utrecht) in 1624, Abcoude and Baambrugge 1625 and Dordrecht 1626; he died in 1636. See Du Rieu, *Album studiosorum*, 142 and Van Lieburg, *Repertorium*, 277.

2 The word occurs in 1 Peter 4:19.

3 There are two parts this disputation: 1) almsgiving (theses 2–38) and 2) fasting and vigils (theses 39–59). Thysius relates almsgiving and fasting to love for our neighbor, the second great commandment (thesis 4). He begins with the definition of almsgiving (theses 2–3), followed by the foundations for almsgiving: the inequality of possessions (theses 5–9) and the bonds between people (theses 10–11). Thesis 12 presents the plan for the rest of this disputation: the persons involved: who gives to whom (theses 13–25), the thing shared and how much is shared (theses 26–27), the acts of giving and receiving, including the topics of loans and lending at interest (theses 28–35), a brief summary of the marks of almsgiving (thesis 36), and the promises joined to it (theses 37–38). For the structure of Part Two, on fasting and vigils (theses 39–59) see note 27 below.

IV Ad *caritatem* itaque *erga proximum*, alteram divini cultus partem referimus. Ut autem caritas haec, ob cohaesionem primae tabulae ad secundam, Jac. 2, 10. 11. et illius per hanc (quod sub externa cultus divini primae tabulae specie hypocritae plurimum lateant, Ose. 6, 6. Matt. 9, 13.) ostensionem, totum Dei cultum et pietatem non raro comprehendit, Matt. 7, 12. Rom. 13, 8. 9. 10., ita et *Eleemosyna*, quae caritatis erga proximum singularis est actus,* gradus eximius, et pars non postrema, pro ea ponitur, et κατ' ἐξοχὴν, justitiae ac caritatis appellationem suscipit, Dan. 4, 27. Hebr. 6, 10.

V Praestituit ea *bonorum proprietatem et inaequalem possessionem*: quamvis enim Deus prima creatione totam terram, et omnia quae in ea sunt, universim in hominis usum crearit, attamen cum protoplasto, ac hominum satori Adamo, Paradisum, ut Basilicam imperatori singulariter attribuerit, et post lapsum edixerit, *In sudore vultus tui comedes panem tuum*; post Diluvium autem, secundum tres filios Noachi, gentium ac terrarum, Deo ita dispensante, facta sit divisio; atque occupatio et traditio et transmissa haereditas, jure belli, aliisque modis acquisitio locum acceperit; communi* et divina et humana lege, rerum* proprietas stabilitur.

VI Ex hac vero possessionis inaequalitate, *divitis pauperisque origo est*. Utriusque autem creatorem se profitetur Deus, Prov. 22, 2. et pauperes nos semper habituros pronunciat Christus, Matt. 26, 11. Veruntamen ut divitiae neminem Deo commendant, ita neque paupertas cuiquam probrosa est, ut quam Christus in persona* sua sanctificavit, 2 Cor. 8, 9. Utrosque pietas approbat, 1 Tim. 6, 17. 18. Matt. 5, 3. Modo dives divitiis non fidens, in humilitate; pauper inopia non diffidens, in sublimitate sua glorietur, Marc. 10, 24. Jac. 1, 9. 10.

VII Neque rerum* proprietas, aut inaequalitas, ab Apostolis sub Evangelii initiis, *communione bonorum inducta*, abolita est, Actor. 2. et 4. *Omnes qui credebant, erant eodem loco, et habebant omnia communia*. Non enim universalis omnium et singulorum Christianorum, neque omnium bonorum ea communio fuit,

And so we relate almsgiving to the love we have for our neighbor, that is, to 4
the second part of the worship of God. But this love frequently includes the entire service and piety toward God (Matthew 7:12; Romans 13:8–10), since the second table of the Law is connected to the first (James 2:10–11) and shown to be so by this love (because hypocrites frequently go undetected by the outward show of the first table's divine worship: Hosea 6:6, Matthew 9:13). In the same way 'almsgiving,' which is a particular act* of love towards the neighbor, a very high degree of love and not its last part, stands for love, and *par excellence* is given the name 'righteousness and love' (Daniel 4:27; Hebrews 6:10).

The premise for almsgiving is ownership of goods and inequality in posses- 5
sions. For God, at the time of the first creation, although He created the world and everything in it for the use of all mankind in general, He gave Paradise to Adam in particular (as the first created human and begetter of all mankind) like a basilica to an emperor; and after the fall, it was to him that He gave the edict: "In the sweat of your brow you will eat your bread." But after the flood, the peoples and lands were divided (with God so disposing it) among the three sons of Noah. And also assuming a place of their own were the taking and giving of possession, the transmission of inheritance, and the acquisition by the right of war or other means. And the ownership of things* is based on a common* law, both divine and human.[4]

The origin of rich and poor comes from this inequality of ownership. God 6
declares that He is the Creator of both rich and poor (Proverbs 22:2), and Christ states that we shall always have the poor (Matthew 26:11). Nevertheless, since riches do not make anyone acceptable to God, so too poverty is not a cause of shame for anyone, since in his own person* Christ has sanctified it (2 Corinthians 8:9). And piety approves rich and poor alike (1 Timothy 6:17–18; Matthew 5:3) so long as the rich person does not confide in his riches but rejoices in his humility and the poor does not despair in his poverty but rejoices in his exaltation (Mark 10:24; James 1:9–10).

And the apostles did not abolish ownership of goods,* or inequality of own- 7
ership, at the beginning of the Gospel-era, by their sharing of goods (Acts 2 and 4): "All who believed were together in one place and held everything in common." For their sharing was not a universal sharing by each and every Christian, nor was it a sharing of all their goods, nor was it presented as precedent, and

4 The common idea among the church fathers and the medieval Scholastics was that private property was only instituted by God after the fall and, consequently, was reflected in human legislation. Cf. Christopher Pierson, *Just Property. A History in the Latin West*. Volume 1: Wealth, Virtue and the Law (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 63–124. The division of the lands is mentioned in Genesis 10.

neque proposita in exemplum et legem perpetuam: sed singulariter in Ecclesia Hierosolymitana, idque pro Ecclesiae illius eo tempore statu, et libera certorum hominum ac bonorum collatione, ut ex cap. 5, 4. apparet. Et sane sicut Christus marsupium habuisse dicitur Joh. 12, 6. et 13, 29., ita et Apostoli et fideles sua possederunt. Unde quoque Eleemosyna locum habuit.

VIII Quare eo ipso non stabilitur *Anabaptistarum* quorundam *communio*, qua bonorum proprietas et possessio, adeoque Eleemosyna inter fideles revera tollitur: neque *Monachalis* quorundam κοινοβιτικὴ, qui singulari instituto, proprietati, dominio atque contrectationi cujuslibet pecuniae, se renunciare profitentur. Unde illud, *Monachus habens obulum, non valet obulum*.

IX Attamen ut *bonorum communio* inter Christianos non sit κτήσει, possessione, manet tamen χρήσει, usu, divina lege in perpetuum fixa, Deut. 15. Marc. 14, 7. quae non est, sicuti Scholastici* quidam volunt, liberae tantum voluntatis* cujusque actio, adeoque ad caritatem hanc tantum cohortatio, sed praecepti seu legis divinae sanctio, conscientiam sub peccato obligans, ac quoad certas ejus circumstantias tantum libera.

perpetual law. But it was a special case in the church at Jerusalem, and it was in response to the state of the church at that particular time, done by the voluntary gathering of certain people and goods, as is clear from chapter 5:4. Moreover, it states clearly that Christ owned a purse (John 12:6 and 13:29); and the apostles and the believers, too, had their own purses. Hence the giving of alms also had its proper place.

8 And so [the sharing of goods recorded in Acts] is not a basis for the communism of some of the Anabaptists, which in reality removes all ownership and possession and consequently also the practice of almsgiving among believers.[5] Nor is it a basis for 'the common life' (*koinobitikē*) of certain monks who profess by a special rule that they renounce property, ownership and any contact with money. Hence the proverb: "A monk who has an obol, isn't worth an obol."[6]

9 Nevertheless, though sharing goods among Christians does not happen by possession, yet it remains by use, and this is fixed by a law of God forever (Deuteronomy 15; Mark 14:7).[7] And this law is not, as some of the Scholastics* would have it, an action only of someone's unbound will* (and so only an encouragement to charity) but an ordinance of God's precept or law that, subject to the charge of sin, binds the conscience and that is free only with respect to some of its circumstances.[8]

---

5 Reformed theologians generally blamed the Anabaptists of teaching a 'community of goods.' From the beginning of the Reformation such doctrines were condemned by the magisterial Reformers and attained a particular notoriety in the wake of the German Peasants' War of 1524–1525 and the Münster rebellion of 1534–1535. However, they continued to be advocated by some Anabaptists into the seventeenth century. James Stayer, *The German Peasants' War and Anabaptist Community of Goods* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1991), 95–97.

6 An obol (from the Greek word *obolos*, 'spit, iron rod') was the smallest unit of currency in ancient Greece. Thysius probably is targeting the Franciscans in particular here. They had always been very much involved in debates on evangelical poverty. Bonaventure, the seventh Superior General of the order, explains in his *Apologia Pauperum* (1269) that Franciscans cannot have property (*proprietas*), ownership (*dominium*) or use money. Cf. Virpi Mäkinen, *Property Rights in the Late Medieval Discussion on Franciscan Poverty* (Leuven: Peeters, 2001), 57–94. In the first version of the Rule of Saint Francis (*Regula non Bullata*), Francis forbade his followers even from touching money (Mäkinen, *Property Rights*, 63, note 20).

7 The Scholastic formula that goods are "private in possession but common in use" is derived from Aristotle, *Politics*, book II, 1263a1–b1. It means that private property is not an absolute right, but should always serve higher individual and social goals. In medieval theology it was associated with God's purpose to provide for all, with the duty of sharing with the poor, and with their rights to use the goods of others in the case of extreme need. Cf. David Lametti, "The objects of virtue," in *Property and Community*, ed. Gregory S. Alexander and Eduardo M. Peñalver (New York / Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 1–37.

8 It is not clear to whom Thysius refers here. As of the late Middle Ages, some thinkers, in

x Ea autem sapiente Dei consilio ac voluntate* nititur, omnia ita temperantis ac varie disponentis, ut uni plura, alteri pauciora attribuerit, pauperemque diviti adjunxerit, Prov. 22, 2. quos *naturae* et communis* sanguinis, et politias vinculo*, (prout homo animal est πολιτικὸν καὶ κοινωνητὸν) conjunxit, ut unus alteri auxiliatrices manus praeberet. adeoque unius abundantia, alienae indigentiae succurreret, Es. 58, 7. 2 Cor. 8. 13. 14. idque eo magis, quod Deus absolutum* et summum dominium sibi reservans, Ps. 24, 1. 1 Cor. 10, 26. utile vero diviti concedens, donorum suorum illum dispensatorem constituerit, ut fideliter ea quoque pauperibus dispensaret, Luc. 16, 10. 11. 12. Quod quamvis debitum, ut tanto fidelius praestaretur, promissiones Deus addidit amplae remunerationis, et fenerationis a Domino, Prov. 19, 17. et neglecti officii graves comminationes, Prov. 21, 13.

xi Accedit ad naturae* et politias vinculum, *singulare Christianitatis*: quo fideles mystici corporis membra, sub capite Christo in unum corpus sociati, Deum habent communem* patrem, Christum Dei Filium primogenitum fratrem, ac a Deo adoptati in filios, spirituque ejus regeniti, inter se fratres, ac universitatis per Christum redduntur haeredes, quo arctius ad singulare opitulationis debitum obstringuntur. Unde et Christus sibi contestatur fieri quod pauperibus suis impenditur, Matt. 25, 40.

xii Sunt porro hic ad pleniorem Eleemosynae tractationem, consideranda, *Personae,** Quis et quibus; *Res,** Quid et quantum sit communicandum; *Communio* ejusque *Modus,* adjunctaque promissio*.

xiii Quoad *personam* erogantem*, est haec virtus et *liberalitas communis* omnium piorum*, quatenus quisque, saltem affectu,* ad omnia caritatis officia promptus esse et pro modulo proximo praestare quod potest, debet; etiam tenuiorum, usque ad unius nummuli, seu minutorum duorum erogationem; instar viduae illius, quae ἐκ τῆς ὑστερήσεως, *e penuria* sua misit totum victum suum, Luc. 21, 4. Imo ad potum aquae frigidae, Matt. 10, 42. Unde et jubetur, ut qui furatus sit, laboret manibus, ut possit impartiri cui opus fuerit, Eph. 4, 28.

---

particular canon lawyers, began to think of private property as an absolute right, based on natural law, which was also valid before the Fall. See Dick Pels, *Property and Power in Social Theory: A Study in Intellectual Rivalry* (London / New York: Routledge, 1998), 53–55. Pope John XXII defended this position in the late 1320s in a dispute with the Franciscan order over poverty (Pierson, *Just Property*, 111–112).

And so [sharing goods by use] is based upon God's wise counsel and will,* 10
which so governs and variously arranges everything that He bestows more upon one and less upon another and has brought together poor and rich (Proverbs 22:2), whom He joined together by a natural* bond and the bonds of common* blood and politics (as man is a civil and social creature)[9] so that the one would offer a hand of support to the other and so the abundance of the one would assist the other in his need (Isaiah 58:7; 2 Corinthians 8:13–14). This all the more so because while God kept the absolute* and highest dominion[10] for himself (Psalm 24:1; 1 Corinthians 10:26), He did grant the use to the wealthy man and established him as the distributor of his gifts, in order to disburse them faithfully also to the poor (Luke 16:10–12). And although the wealthy had the duty to do this, God added promises of rich reward and interest from the Lord so that it might be conducted much more faithfully (Proverbs 19:17), and He added serious warnings, should the task be ignored (Proverbs 21:13).

A uniquely Christian bond is added to our natural* and civil bonds. By this 11
bond the believers, as members of a mystical body, are united into one body under Christ their head and have God as their common* Father, and Christ, God's first-born Son, as their Brother. Having been adopted by God into sons and regenerated by his Spirit, they are brothers of one another, and through Christ they become heirs of everything, and by Him they are obligated more stringently to the special debt of offering assistance. Hence Christ, too, declares that what is done for His poor is done to Him (Matthew 25:40).

For a more complete treatment of almsgiving we should also consider: the 12
persons* (who and for whom), the thing* (what and how much should be shared), the act of sharing and the way* it is done, and also the promises that are joined to it.

As far as the person* giving is concerned, this is a virtue and generosity 13
that all devout people share,* to the extent that everyone, at least in their affection,* should be ready for every duty of charity and to offer what he can to his neighbor, as his modest means allow. This virtue belongs also to those of slender means and goes as far as paying one or two small coins—like that widow who from her poverty (*ek tēs hysterēseōs*) put in her entire livelihood (Luke 21:4). Indeed, it extends to giving a drink of cool water (Matthew 10:42); and for this reason the thief is ordered to work with his hands, so that he might be able to provide for him who has need (Ephesians 4:28). And in God's

9 Cf. Aristotle, *Politics* 1.2, 1253a3: "Man is by nature a political animal."

10 'Dominion' (*dominium*) usually denotes the strongest form of ownership. Cf. Pierson, *Just Property*, 80, 94.

Quod officium apud Deum non copia, aut pretio externo, sed affectu* cordis, et animi promptitudine aestimatur.

XIV Sed imprimis *peculiaris est piorum divitum*, quos Deus bonis amplificavit, quorum copia atque abundantia servire debet indigentiae aliorum, idque κατὰ δύναμιν ἐκ τοῦ περισσεύοντος, *ex eo quod abundat*, Marc 12, 44. τὰ ἔνοντα, *ea qua supersunt*, seu adsunt, Luc. 11, 41. erogare tenentur. Imo, si usus ita ferat, ὑπὲρ δύναμιν αὐθαίρετοι, *supra vires voluntarii*, esse possunt, 2 Cor. 8, 3. usque ad decimas. Luc. 18, 12. ad dimidiam bonorum partem, Luc. 19, 8.

XV Neque tamen *omnes facultates*,* cum calamitate propria, profundendae, 2 Cor. 8, 12. 13. Nam quoque sibi suisque prospicere fidelem, fides jubet, 1 Tim, 3, 4. 5. et caritas quae ordinata est, exigit, Matt. 22, 39. et Christianae prudentiae est fontem apud se servare, ut perennis quasi liberalitatis rivus, inde ad alios derivetur. Nisi forte singulare mandatum, Marc. 12, 41. aut praesentissima necessitas, 1 Cor. 13, 3. aliud deposcant.

XVI Illo autem Christi dicto Luc. 12, 33. *Vendite bona vestra, et date Eleemosynam*, venditionis necessitas* non imperatur, sed declaratur, quo animo fideles affecti potius esse debeant, quam ut egestate pereant pauperes: scilicet quod absolute* dicitur, comparate accipiendum est. Aut dum Matt. 19, 21. juveni diviti dicit, *si vis perfectus esse, vende quae habes et da pauperibus*, hic ultra Dei legem perfectionem* perfectis non proponit: sed universalem legem, quod omnia, etiam vitam debeamus Deo imperante abnegare, Marc. 8, 34. 36. particulariter mandato singulari, ad aegrum ejus animum accommodat, atque avaritiae latentem morbum in apertum producit, tantum abest, ut, quod arroganter jactitabat, legem implevisse concedat, ut hoc ipso, quantum ab eo absit, demonstret, ut sequentia manifeste arguunt.

eyes, this duty is not assessed by the amount or the outward price, but by the affection* of the heart, and the readiness of the soul.

14 But [this virtue] is peculiar to the pious people who are wealthy, whose goods God has increased, whose riches and abundance ought to serve the needs of others, and they should do so out of their abundance (Mark 12:44). They are bound to give "what they have left over," or from what they have (Luke 11:41). In fact, if it should be of use, then they can be "willing beyond their means" (2 Corinthians 8:3), as much as a tenth (Luke 18:12) of their goods, even up to a half (Luke 19:8).

15 And yet they should not pour forth all their resources* to the point of their own financial demise (2 Corinthians 8:12–13). For the faith bids the believer to provide also for himself and those dear to him (1 Timothy 3:4–5), and well-ordered love demands it (Matthew 22:39). And it is characteristic of Christian prudence to reserve for oneself a source, that a kind of river of generosity may flow perennially, from which one can draw for others—unless it happens that a specific commandment (Mark 12:41) or a pressing need (1 Corinthians 13:3) demands otherwise.

16 When, in Luke 12:33, Christ speaks these words, "sell your possessions and give alms," he does not order that selling is a must;* he is declaring more the attitude that should affect believers, than that they should perish from poverty as poor people. In other words, what he says in an absolute* sense we should understand in a relative sense. Or when in Matthew 19:21 he says to the rich young man, "if you wish to be perfect, sell what you have and give to the poor," then he is not proposing a perfection* for the perfect over and above God's law.[11] Instead, he is adapting the universal law that we should deny ourselves everything—even our own lives, should God demand it (Mark 8:34, 36)—in a particular situation to his specific order for the unwell soul of the man, and he brings out into the open the hidden disease of his greed. As the subsequent account clearly reveals, the man shows by his proud boast in admitting he has fulfilled the law how far that is off the mark.

---

11 For the 'supererogatory works' see *SPT* 33 antithesis 9, note 29, *SPT* 34.31, and thesis 20 below. The voluntary poverty of monks and friars was considered as one of the works that went beyond what was required from all by divine law. According to Aquinas there are two 'states of perfection': the state of bishops and the state of members of religious orders; see *SPT* 23.30, note 20. These states are not about one's personal, inner holiness, but about the office and public tasks in the Church to which one has committed one's life by some kind of official and formal act of dedication. The 'perfect' here refers to those who have taken the monastic vow of poverty. Cf. Stephen J. Pope, "Overview of the Ethics of Thomas Aquinas," in *The Ethics of Aquinas*, ed. Stephen J. Pope (Washington: Georgetown University Press, 2002), 30–53, 48.

XVII Ii porro *Quibus erogari debet*, sunt miserabiles et commiserandae personae, puta omnes pauperes: voce pauperis generaliori notione accepta, tam pro mendicis qui nihil habent, quam egenis qui parum et sibi ipsis ad vitam non sufficiunt, saltem secundum vitae praesentem conditionem ad tempus, Ps. 41, 2. Esa. 26, 6. id est, qui vitae hujus subsidiis et aliena ope indigent. De quibus Christus, *Omni petenti dato*, Matt. 5, 42. Quo non intelligitur quilibet petens universim, sed ex egestate, ac talis, qui retribuere non potest, Luc. 14, 12.

XVIII In quorum numero non habemus, *validos, vagos, et professos mendicantes*, qui saepe vitiosissimi, turpi otio et inertia obtorpentes, mendicitatem exercent, et in ea vitae praesidium collocantes, miseriam, variis artibus et impostu-ris vafre excogitatis, quibus misericordiam moveant, simulantes, publice aut ostiatim obeuntes, aut per frequentia compita projecti, stipem petunt, atque ita alienum panem injuste vorant, imo quaestum et opimum proventum, ex ea saepe faciunt, contra legem primitus positam, *In sudore vultus tui comedes panem tuum*, Gen. 3. quam interpretatur Paulus, *ut qui non velit operari, non comedat*, 2 Thess. 3, 10. 11. Non enim illi revera inopes, qui labore manuum suarum cum pascere se possint, vere egentibus quod ipsis debitum praeripiunt. Atque hi profecto doli furtique, imo sacrilegii rei sunt.

XIX Attamen eodem loco non habemus *mendicos eos*, qui ob caritatis defectum, quod pauperibus legitimo modo* juxta legem Dei, Deut. 15, 4. non prospiciatur, necessitate quae legem hactenus non habet, coguntur stipem, vel ad privatas aedes, ut ulcerosus Lazarus, Luc. 16, 20. vel in publica via, ut caecus ille, Luc. 18, 35. et claudus, Act. 3, 2. mendicare.

XX Sed contra, validis illis mendicantibus *mendicabula illa Monastica, seu ordi-nes mendicantes* accensemus; qui (novo instituto, contra vetustatem, quae Monachos non agnoscit nisi laborantes, otiosos vero ventres similes praedoni-bus facit, Socrat. in tripart. hist. lib. 8.[a]) sub specie pietatis, superstitione insigni,

[a] Cassiodorus, *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita* 8.1 (CSEL 71:455–462).

And as for those "to whom should be given," they are the pitiable people worthy of our compassion, that is, all who are poor. Taking the word 'poor' in the general sense, it stands for beggars who have no possessions and also for those who have very little and do not provide for themselves what they need to live, at least according to the present condition of life for a time (Psalm 41:2; Isaiah 26:6). That is, they are people who lack the supports of this life, and need someone else's assistance. About these people Christ says: "Give to all who ask" (Matthew 5:42). And that does not mean generally each and every person who asks, but him who asks out of need, and such as are unable to repay (Luke 14:12). 17

But we do not consider among their number those who are fit, or wayfarers and professional beggars, who, having been dulled by their base and idle laziness, practice mendicancy and put the security of their livelihood on it, and by feigning a state of wretchedness, by means of various tricks and craftily thought-up pretenses with which they would arouse compassion, by going about in public, door-to-door, or showing up at busy crossroads, they ask for a small gift, and in this way they unfairly eat up someone else's bread. In fact, they often make a profit and a rich income from it, contrary to the law that had been made at the beginning, "in the sweat of your brow you shall eat your bread" (Genesis 3[:19]), which Paul interprets, "if anyone does not want to work, he should not eat" (2 Thessalonians 3:10–11). For they are not truly needy who, while they are able to feed themselves from the labor of their hands, actually rob those who are truly needy of what is owed to them. But these people surely are guilty of deceit and robbery, even sacrilege. 18

But we do not put in the same category those beggars who due to a lack of charity are forced to beg for help—since no provision is made for those who are poor in a legitimate way* according to God's law (Deuteronomy 15:4)—out of necessity (which at this point does not consider the law)[12] either at private houses, like the sore-covered Lazarus (Luke 16:20), or in the open street, like that blind man (Luke 18:35) and the cripple (Acts 3:2). 19

On the other hand, however, among them we do reckon those beggars who are healthy, those monastic beggars or mendicant orders, who by a new arrangement that goes against antiquity (which acknowledged only monks who worked and which considered 'the lazy bellies' as robbers; Socrates in [Cassiodorus,] *Tripartite Ecclesiastical History*, book 8),[13] and who under the 20

12 Literally "necessity has no law," which is a classic rule of canon law.

13 Thysius refers to the *Tripartite Ecclesiastical History* of Cassiodorus (480–570), who makes use of the church history written by Socrates of Constantinople (also called Socrates Scholasticus) around 440. In book 8, chapter 1, Cassiodorus quotes from Socrates's *Historia Ecclesiastica* (book 4, chapter 23) that a monk who has not worked is judged to be similar to a covetous man.

voluntariam paupertatem et mendicitatem, quibus bonis propriis rejectis, inhiatur alienis, deque aliorum labore et sudore vivitur, imo sub hoc praetextu ipsissima possidetur terrenarum rerum abundantia; quasi[a] crucem ex voto perpetuo sibi ipsis sponte imponunt, et ultro subeunt; quae tamen non adsciscenda, sed a Deo imposita patienter ferenda erat; atque externam hanc Dei maledictionem, Deut. 28, 22. quae deprecanda, et quoad ejus fieri potest* effugienda, in benedictione ponunt, imo in pietate et sanctimonia, operibusque perfectionis* et perfectorum, cui et maxima merita, etiam supererogationis ascribunt.

XXI Atque illi quidem in bene constituta Republica ferendi neutiquam sunt, Deo edicente, *Et omnino mendicus non erit inter vos*, quo non modo lex de officio cujusque, sed et mendicitati quadantenus ponitur; quod idem quoque Imperator sequitur, Codice de *Validis mendicantibus*.[b] Quos insuper in Ecclesia ἀτάκτως, *inordinate*, id est, contra ordinem a Deo positum se gerentes, nutriendos tolerandosque esse negat Apostolus, imo notandos praescribit, 2 Thess. c. 3. a v. 6. ad 13.

XXII Per *petentes* ergo intelliguntur ii, qui merito petunt, ac necessitate* petere coguntur, adeoque post prudentem inspectionem et explorationem, digni misericordia et liberalitate habentur. Ac primo ordine sunt *Viduae et Pupilli*, Ex. 22, 22. 2. *Peregrini*. Lev. 10, 18.[c] 3. *Debiles et aegroti* in quorum censu sunt claudi, surdi, caeci, muti, leprosi, etc. Matt. 25, 36. Luc. 14, 13. 4. *Aetate infirmi*, ut pueri et senes, 1 Tim. 5. 3. 16. 5. Qui *variis casibus nulla sua culpa*, ut naufragio, eluvione, incendio, latrocinio, incursionibus hostium, etc. ad paupertatem redacti sunt; quibus adjungimus verecundos pauperes, non audentes suam egestatem profiteri. Denique qui *ob confessionem Evangelii* facultatibus* suis exuti sunt, Hebr. 10. Cum quibus conjungimus *captivos* ab hostibus, praesertim religionis

[a] quique: 1642. [b] *Codex Justinianus* 11.26. See Paul Krüger (ed.), *Corpus Juris Civilis*, vol. 2, *Codex Justinianus*, 13th ed. (Berlin: Weidmann, 1963), 435. [c] The reference is not clear, possibly Leviticus 19:10 is meant.

guise of piety, with remarkable superstition, [adopt] voluntary poverty and mendicancy, whereby they do away with their personal possessions, and gobble up those belonging to another, and live off the hard work and sweat of other people; in fact, under this very pretext of poverty they possess a vast amount of earthly possessions. And with a perpetual vow they willingly take this cross upon themselves and volunteer to undergo it. This is a cross that they ought not to assume upon themselves but which should be borne patiently if God had placed it upon them; and this outward curse of God (Deuteronomy 28:22), which people should pray Him to avert (and they should flee from it, insofar as that is possible* with God's curse), they put under the category of blessing, indeed of piety and sanctity, and works of perfection* and of people who are perfect, and to this punishment they ascribe the greatest merits, even the merits of supererogation.[14]

And yet in a well-established nation those mendicants should in no way be 21
tolerated, since God's command, "and there shall be no needy among you,"[15] is not just a rule posited about everyone's duty but to some extent it is also about mendicancy. And even the emperor follows this same law, in the *Codex Concerning Healthy Beggars*.[16] And those who moreover conduct themselves in the church in a disorderly fashion (*ataktōs*)—that is, contrary to God's order—should not, the apostle states, be given food or tolerated, but he prescribes that they should rather be reprimanded (2 Thessalonians 3:6–13).

With the words "those who ask"[17] are meant those who ask for good reason, 22
and who are compelled* to ask, and so who upon thoughtful inquiry and investigation are considered deserving of mercy and generosity. Foremost among their ranks are: 1) widows and orphans (Exodus 22:22), 2) foreigners (Leviticus 10:18), 3) the weak and infirm, among whom are counted the lame, deaf, blind, dumb, leprous, etc. (Matthew 25:36; Luke 14:13), 4) those who are weak on account of age, like infants and the elderly (1 Timothy 5:3, 16), 5) are those who ask for various reasons not their own fault, like people who have been driven to poverty by shipwreck, floods, fires, robbery, attacks of enemies, etc.; and we add to them the bashful poor who do not dare to admit their needs. And lastly, it includes 6) those who for professing the Gospel have been stripped of their financial means* (Hebrews 10[:34]). With these people we link those who have been captured by enemies, especially enemies of the Christian religion.* Some

14 On 'supererogatory works' see *SPT* 33 antithesis 9, note 29, *SPT* 34.31, and thesis 16 above.

15 Deuteronomy 15:4.

16 The Codex of the Byzantine Emperor Justinian from the early sixth century is part of the *Corpus Iuris Civilis*. It has a rule against healthy beggars in book 11.26.

17 Matthew 5:42.

Christi.* Ex his autem quidam corpore imbecilles, alii arte parandi victum destituti, alii denique etiam si quidvis agant, sibi tamen satis prospicere nequeunt; qui juvandi pro ratione cujusque, quidam omnino, quidam ex parte, quidam denique ad tempus tantum.

XXIII Per *omnem* vero *petentem* intellige quemcunque talem, sine discrimine, sive sit peregrinus, aut civis et popularis, alienus vel consanguineus, amicus aut inimicus, fidelis aut infidelis, Matt. 5, 34. 44. et Luc. 6, 27. 32. In summa *proximus quisque*. Est autem proximus quilibet, qui nostra ope indiget secundum praesentem statum, et cui succurrendi juvandique nobis occasio et facultas* praebetur, ut contra Judaeos docet Christus in parabola saucii, Luc. 10, 30.

XXIV Interea tamen secundum gradus conjunctionis et communionis, major exercenda benignitas in suos, videlicet *consanguineos, quam alienos*, 1 Tim. 5, 8. 16. *domesticos fidei et sanctos*, quam *Gentiles*, Gal. 6, 10. quae quidem φιλαδελφία singulariter dicitur, 2 Pet. 1, 7. Sed a suis incipiendum quidem, non autem in suis consistendum est.

XXV In his censendi non sunt *Pastores et Doctores Ecclesiarum*, ut quidam arbitrati sunt. Ipsis enim non eleemosyna, sed merces laborum penditur, Matt. 10, 10. 1 Cor. 9, 4. 7. 1 Tim. 5, 18. Quod vero mulieres quaedam Christo de facultatibus* suis ministrasse dicuntur, Luc. 8, 2. 3. quamvis in illis singularis fuerit liberalitas, tamen ab illis ipsis gestum, et in illis confirmatum id, quod suos docuit et praecepit universim Christus, 1 Cor. 9, 14.

XXVI Tantum de personis.* *Res** vero *ipsa eroganda*, non in sola erogatione, sed in omni ope et opere consistit, quo humana indigentia sublevatur, ut ea a Christo designantur, nempe frangere esurienti panem, potum dare sitienti, vestem nudo et algenti, tectum et hospitium peregrino; item redemptionem captivo,

of them are physically feeble, others robbed of the ability to obtain a living, and still others who are not able to provide enough for themselves regardless of however much they do. These people should be assisted each according to his or her need; some completely, others partially, and again some others only for a period of time.

And so you should understand the words "everyone who asks"[18] to mean any 23
such person (without discrimination), whether he is a foreigner or a citizen and compatriot, stranger or relative by blood, friend or foe, believer or unbeliever (Matthew 5.34, 44 and Luke 6:27, 32). In short, "every neighbor." And therefore our neighbor is anyone at all who is in need of our help in light of the state he is in, and for whose help and assistance we are given the opportunity and the means,* as Christ teaches (over against the Jews) in the parable of the wounded man (Luke 10:30).

But at the same time we should, depending on the degree of affinity and 24
fellowship, exercise greater generosity towards those who are our own, namely our relatives, than to strangers (1 Timothy 5:8, 16); and towards members of the household of faith and the saints rather than the gentiles (Galatians 6:10); it is this especially that 2 Peter 1:7 calls "brotherly love." But while we should begin with those who are own, we ought not to stop with them.

We should not consider among this group [of all who ask] the "pastors 25
and teachers of the churches," as some have thought.[19] For what is paid to them are not alms but remuneration for work that is done (Matthew 10:10; 1 Corinthians 9:4, 7; 1 Timothy 5:18). And as to the fact that it says some women ministered to Christ from their own financial resources* (Luke 8:2,3), although they displayed exceptional generosity, yet what was done and confirmed by those women themselves is what Christ generally taught and instructed his own to do (1 Corinthians 9:14).

So much concerning the persons.* As for the actual "thing* that is to be 26
given," it consists not only of payment but of any help and work that lightens human need as Christ designates them: breaking bread for the hungry; giving a drink to the thirsty and clothing to him who is cold, shelter and hospitality to the stranger; and similarly, offering ransom for the captive, and care for the sick

18 Matthew 5:42 and Luke 6:30.

19 The disputation in the first repetition of the *Synopsis* series shows that this statement is a polemical remark against the application of the command of Christ to give alms to those who asks for them to mendicant monks "who live from someone else's labor and sweat," because the pastors and teachers of the church deserve to be paid for their work. Antonius Thysius, *Disputationum theologicarum repetitarum trigesima-septima, de Eleemosysis & Iejuniis*, resp. Caspar P. Thornai (Leiden: Elzevir, 1627), thesis 10.

aegrotanti curam praestare, Es. 58, 7. Matt. 25, 35. Luc. 3, 11. et 14, 12. Quae alibi revocantur ad victum et habitationem, 1 Tim. 6, 8.

XXVII Non autem *de alieno, ac injuste partis* (quod furti est) largiendum. Eoque non facit illud, *Facite vobis amicos de Mammona iniquitatis*, ut quod non tam de opibus male partis intelligendum (cum velit Deus liberalitatem fluere ex fonte puro) quam quod plurimum injuste iis homines abutantur, Luc. 19, 8.

XXVIII Ipsius porro *communionis seu communicationis pauperum modus** respectu donantis quidem est, ut det quisque non tantum ratione rerum, *secundum facultates* suas*, sed etiam ratione animi, *non hypocritice et ambitiose*, id est, cum vana ostentatione in aperto coram hominibus, ad gloriam suam, sed *sincere et in abscondito* coram et propter Deum, Matt. 6, 1. 2. 4. *Non coacte* ex imperio aliorum, ac necessitate et cum animi tristitia, sed *voluntarie, lubenter, prompto atque hilari animo*. Alias Deo gratum et acceptum esse non potest, Rom. 12, 8. 2 Cor. 8, 12. et 9, 7. *Non mercedis accipiendae studio* ac spe, sed gratiose: illud enim non humanitas aut caritas, sed officii esset venatio ac feneratio, Luc. 6, 33. *Non parce, sed liberaliter*, 2 Cor. 9, 6. Denique *ex fide erga Deum*, et Christum, 1 Tim. 1, 5. et *caritate erga proximum*, 1 Cor. 13, 3. Ea enim actio ita et voluntatis* et potestatis est, Marc. 14, 7. ut nihilominus regenda sit ad caritatis regulam.

XXIX Respectu vero *ejus cui datur*; ut administretur habita necessitate cujusque, scilicet *aequabilitate quadam, et geometrica proportione*, id est, cum discretione personae,* causae, loci, et temporis, seu quando, quatenus, ubi et quomodo; in quibus prudentia et circumspectio maxime spectatur, 2 Cor. 8.

XXX *Pauperum* vicissim *qui Eleemosynam accipiunt*, officium est, ut sua conditione sint contenti, non petant, nisi ii, et quousque vere egentes sunt; pauca

(Isaiah 58:7; Matthew 25:35; Luke 3:11 and 14:12). Elsewhere these are summed up as "food and shelter" (1 Timothy 6:8).

One should not, however, give away what belongs to someone else, or what 27
has been obtained unjustly—that is robbery. And therefore the following text does not apply here: "Make for yourselves friends by means of unrighteous Mammon,"[20] since that should be taken not so much as being about wrongly obtained wealth (since it is God's will that our generosity should flow forth from a source that is pure) as about people's very frequently unjust abuse of it.

Then again, regarding the one who gives, the mode* of the actual commu- 28
nion and imparting with the poor is that with respect to the goods everyone should not only give according to his own financial means,* but also sincerely and secretly—for God and in his presence—with respect to his intention: not hypocritically and for self-advancement, that is, by false display in the open to be seen by men for the sake of one's own glory (Matthew 6:1, 2, 4). It should not be done under pressure, on the command of other people, by obligation and with a heavy heart; but willingly, readily, promptly, and with a cheerful heart. Otherwise it would not be pleasing and acceptable to God (Romans 12:8; 2 Corinthians 8:12 and 9:7). It should not be done from a desire and hope of receiving financial gain, but graciously, for the former would not be humane or charitable, but the professional pursuit of financial profit (Luke 6:33). It should not be done sparingly, but bountifully (2 Corinthians 9:6). And lastly it should be done out of faith in God and Christ (1 Timothy 1:5), and out of love towards our neighbor (1 Corinthians 13:3). For in this way that deed is both of will* and power (Mark 14:7) and so that it should nevertheless be governed by the rule of love.

But regarding the one to whom it is given, it should be administered accord- 29
ing to the need that each person* has; that is, by a certain equality and geometric proportion.[21] It should be done with discernment of the person, cause, place and time; or when, to what extent, where and in what way. In these things prudence and circumspection very much should be kept in view (2 Corinthians 8).

In their turn, the poor who receive alms have the duty to be content with 30
their lot and should not ask unless they are truly needy, and ask only to the extent that they are needy. And with an equally cheerful heart they should

20 Luke 16:9.

21 In *Nicomachean Ethics* 5.3 (1131a10–1131b24) Aristotle explains the concept of 'just' by using the geometrical proportion: line A is to line B as line C is to line D. Likewise, 'just' consists in the equality of two ratios: a:b = c:d. In this case, it means that if the need of one person is twice as much as that of another person, he should be given twice as much. For a different application of the concept of equality see *SPT* 34.37–38.

hilari animo donata, hilari similiter animo accipiant; semper existiment, id multum et magnum esse, quod sufficit ad naturae* sustentationem, Deoque gratias agant quod excitarit pios qui ipsis prospiciant.

XXXI *Cura* haec pauperum, vel *privata est*, qua singulorum; vel *publica*, qua egenis omnibus in ordinem redactis, in Republica a Magistratu pio, aut in Ecclesia ab ejus praefectis, per viros graves, providos, idoneos, et publico testimonio* probatos, sub spontanea religiosi populi munificentia, ab omnibus viritim et in capita collectione facta, in commune* et ex publico, fideliter et prudenter, pro necessitate cujusque, prospicitur.

XXXII Cui fini* Respub. *Eleemosynarios*, Ecclesia *Diaconos*, et *Diaconiam*, sc. pauperum, Act. 6, 1. et *Gazophylacium*, seu sacrum Thesaurum, non tantum rebus Ecclesiae, sed et pauperibus alendis instituit, Luc. 21, 1. Quare et Ecclesiae thesaurus, pauperum singulariter dicitur. Unde a piis majoribus xenodochia, nosocomia, gerontocomia, orphanotrophia, brephotrophia, viduarum domus, etc. religiose passim exstrui coeperunt. Quibus si communis* et universalis sollicitudo pauperum accedat,[a] vix quicquam ad curam pauperum deerit. At hic rejicimus eorum sententiam, qui sub praetextu privatae ac liberae curae pauperum, publicam eversum eunt, et contra.

XXXIII Cum Eleemosyna autem cohaeret, imo sub ea comprehenditur *mutui datio*, quae egenis, qui non omnino, et ad tempus tantum egent, impenditur, quibus mutuo dato consulendum est, idque sine fenore, secundum illud Deut. 15, 8.

[a] accedit: 1642.

accept the little that is given from a cheerful heart. And they should always think that what is sufficient for sustaining natural* life is much, and great, and they should thank God for causing pious people to arise who care for them.

This care of the poor is either private, for individuals, or it is public, when 31
for all the needy people taken together who have been driven by want into this category. In a nation, a devout magistrate provides the care, or in the church its leaders. And the care is provided through serious, careful, suitable men who have been approved also by public testimony,* with the support of the spontaneous munificence of religious people, after a collection has been taken from everyone, man for man, and person by person, for common* use and openly, faithfully and wisely, in accordance with the need of each poor person.

The nation appointed almoners for this purpose,* while the church ap- 32
pointed deacons and the deaconry (i.e., for the poor; Acts 6:1), as well as the Gazophylacium, or 'sacred treasury,' not only for the church's business but also to provide support to the poor (Luke 21:1). And for this reason the church's treasury goes by the special name of treasury for the poor. And hence our pious ancestors devoutly undertook everywhere to build guest-houses, hospitals, homes for the aged, orphanages, nurseries for children, homes for the widows, etc. If a common* and universal concern for the poor is added to these, then the care for the poor will lack hardly anything at all. Yet on this point we reject the thinking of those who under pretense of individual and voluntary care for the poor cause the public care to be overthrown, and vice versa.[22]

And connected to almsgiving, in fact included in it, is giving a loan, which 33
is paid to those who are not altogether needy, but needy for a short period of time. And we must care for such people by giving a loan, which should be done without interest, according to that statement in Deuteronomy 15:8:

22 From the final quarter of the sixteenth century onward, there was a great debate in the Protestant cities in the Netherlands on the relation between the poor relief system of municipal institutions and the Reformed diaconate. Poor relief was a key instrument in negotiating between the social order and the religious orthodoxy of the people. Some have argued that the Reformed diaconate played an important role in the protestantization of the Dutch city population. There were three trends: the diaconate merged with a city poor relief agency (Leiden, Gouda, later in Delft), the two systems coexisted beside one another (Haarlem, Amsterdam), or the diaconate took over poor relief for the whole city (Dordrecht, earlier in Delft). Especially in Leiden, city magistrates were strongly opposed to the political and social intervention of Reformed institutions, while the opposite was the case in Dordrecht. Cf. Charles H. Parker, *The Reformation of Community. Social Welfare and Calvinist Charity in Holland, 1572–1620* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 155–190. Thysius might have in mind the magistrates of Dordrecht, on the one hand, and those of Leiden on the other.

Aperies manum tuam pauperi, et dabis mutuum quo eum indigere prospexeris, et Psalmistae, *Justus miseretur et commodat*, Ps. 37, 26. Quod repetit Christus, *Petenti abs te dato, et volentem mutuari ne aversator*, Matt. 5, 42. et Luc. 6, 35. *Mutuum date, nihil inde sperantes*, id est, supra sortem, neque paria, ut ex vers. 34. apparet: imo si res ita deposcat, ne sortem quidem ipsam, scilicet puro benefaciendi animo: quo sensu secundum excessum quendam sermonis, id comparate accipitur, qualiter et alia eodem loci.

XXXIV Licet tamen egentibus *mutuare, sub ratione pignoris* ad sortis certitudinem, Ex. 22, 25. 26. Deut 24, 10. at cum fenore et incremento non licet. Est vero *fenus* quod in Scripturis Sacris prohibetur, hoc ipsum tantum, quod cum pauperibus exercetur. Unde et Hebr. נשך a morsu et arrosione nomen habet, et fere ejus fit mentio, cum de indigis et oppressis agitur, Ex. 22, 25. Lev. 25, 35. 36. 37. et Prov. 22, 7. *Usura* vero quae cum mediocris fortunae aut ditioribus exercetur, ad caritatis et aequitatis legem redacta, contractus legitimi species* est, atque interesse rationem habet.

XXXV Unde sane *fenus illud quod cum pauperibus sub ratione pignoris exercetur*, et in Christianitate a Magistratu in quibusdam, quamvis boni alicujus respectu, permittitur, saevum et immane est: tum fenore ipso, tum ipsius immensitate, cui in bene constituta Republica locus esse nemini debet. Nedum ut Judaeis in opprobrium et oppressionem Christianorum, in ipsos feneratio impune concedatur, Deut. 23, 19. 20. et 28, 13. 44. sed contra ut pauperi Eleemosynis publicis

"Open your hand, and you will lend him sufficient for what he is in need." And the Psalmist: "The just man shows mercy and lends" (Psalm 37:26); which Christ repeats: "Give to him who asks, and do not turn aside from the one who would borrow" (Matthew 5:42; Luke 6:35). And in Luke 6:35 it says: "Give a loan, expecting nothing in return." That is to say: expect in return nothing more than the principal amount, and not even the same amount, as is clear from verse 34. In fact, if the situation demands it, don't expect back even the principal; i.e., give from a heart that purely does what is good—which (by some exaggeration of the wording) has the sense of being taken comparatively,[23] as are also the other things in the same passage.

And yet to those in need it is permitted to lend by way of a pledge as security 34
for the principal amount (Exodus 22:26; Deuteronomy 24:10), but it is not right to lend for a profit or premium. In fact, in Scripture the one kind of profit-making that is prohibited is only in the case of an arrangement with the poor and oppressed. And for that reason also the Hebrew word *neshekh* ('interest') is the word for biting and gnawing, and it is mentioned nearly always when it deals with the poor and the oppressed (Exodus 22:25; Leviticus 25:35–37; Proverbs 22:7). But lending at interest, which is practiced on those who are of moderate means or wealthier, when collected according to the law of love and fairness, is a kind* of legitimate contract and belongs to monetary gain.

Hence the lending to the poor for financial gain that is practiced in the form 35
of a pledge, and that is permitted by the magistrates in Christendom to a certain degree because of something good, is clearly cruel and harsh. Because of the lending at interest itself, and because of the amounts of it, a well-established nation ought to have no place for anyone to practice this.[24] And just as it is not granted to the Jews to shame and oppress Christians by practicing usury over them with impunity (Deuteronomy 23:19–20 and 28:13, 44), but, instead, so too

23 The expression 'expecting nothing in return' (Luke 6:35) is explained comparatively from verse 34 where it says that sinners hope 'to receive as much in return.' For another example of an explanation in a comparative sense see *SPT* 21.35.

24 Thysius here rebukes the Dutch magistrates who embraced the economic benefits of early capitalism and took little efforts to prevent excessive practices of pawnbrokers who came from Lombardy or Piedmont in Italy. Although the lending banks claimed to help the poor, they rather tended to fleece them by lending money only on pawn and at high interest rates that could rise up to 50% or even 80%. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the Reformed church repeatedly denounced such abuses. See Willem J. van Asselt, "'A Grievous Sin': Gisbertus Voetius (1589–1676) and his Anti-Lombard Polemic," in *Church and School in Early Modern Protestantism: Studies in Honor of Richard Muller on the Maturation of a Theological Tradition*, ed. David Sytsma, Jordan J. Ballor, and Jason Zuidema (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 505–520.

consulendum est, ita et quorundam egestati caritatis (ut vocant) ara, sub nudo pignore instituta, publica auctoritate, et administratione prospiciendum est. Neque quicquam ulterius accipiendum, quam quod fert pecuniae ei usui assumptae, si aliter e publico fieri nequit, et impensarum ratio. Tantum abest ut rem inde facere liceat.

XXXVI *In summa*, in indigos et inopes, sympathia, benevolentia, et beneficentia cujusque generis, sub Eleemosyna comprehenditur.

XXXVII Cui fini* a Domino illis ipsis, qui miserentur pauperum, ampla promittitur remuneratio et retributio, Proverb. 19, 17. *praemium et merces*, Matt. 6, 4. et 10, 41. 2 Cor. 9. Pronunciatur *quod fenerentur Domino*, Prov. 19, 17. *Quod erunt beati*, Prov. 14, 21. Luc. 14, 13. *iis benedicetur*, Prov. 12. *Erunt quasi hortus irriguus, et fons aquarum, cujus aquae non deficient*, Es. 58, 11. Promittuntur bona vitae hujus, tum *corporalis et temporalis*, 2 Cor. 9, 8. 9. 10. 11. tum *spiritualis et aeternae*, ut *peccatorum abruptio*, et condonatio, Dan. 4. *Mundatio*, Luc. 11, 41. *Justitiae perpetuitas*, Ps. 112, 9. *Thesaurus certus in coelo*, Luc. 12, 33. et 18, 22. *Receptus in aeterna tabernacula*, Luc. 16, 9. *Vitae aeternae possessio et haereditas*, Matt. 25. idque *ex justitia divina*, Hebr. 6, 10.

XXXVIII In quibus Eleemosyna non statuitur *tantorum bonorum causa*,* sed *antecedens*, quod talibus haec bona obtingant, neque αἰτιολογία redditur *e causa, sed effectu*, aut *proprio adjuncto*, et si ratio* aliqua causae indicatur, id fit, *non per se, seb per accidens*,* respectu conjunctionis caritatis hujus cum fide, atque Divinae reputationis. Equidem *fide purificantur corda*, Act. 15, 9. *Remissio peccatorum, mundatio, et vita aeterna* merita Christi sunt, et vita aeterna *donum Dei, et haereditas filiorum Dei est*, atque ad εὐδοκίαν Dei refertur, Luc. 12, 32. et Matt. 25.

as one must look after the poor by means of public almsgiving, should public authority and management look after the needs of some people by furnishing an 'altar of love' (as it is called) without any pledge. And one should not accept anything more than the amount of the money that has been taken for that use (if it cannot come from the public purse in any other way) and a reimbursement for the costs. In no way should such lending result in profit.[25]

In short, included in almsgiving are: sympathy, benevolence, and beneficence of every kind towards the poor and helpless. 36

And for this goal* the Lord promises to those who bestow pity upon the poor "a rich reward and recompense" (Proverbs 19:17), a "reward and a prize" (Matthew 6:4 and 10:41; 2 Corinthians 9[:12]). It is declared that "they are lending unto the Lord" (Proverbs 19:17), that "they will be blessed" (Proverbs 14:21; Luke 14:13[and 14]), that "blessings will be given to them" (Proverbs 12[:12]), and that "they will be like well-watered gardens, and like a fountain of water whose springs will never fail" (Isaiah 58:11). The good things of this life are promised to them—both bodily and temporal things (2 Corinthians 9:8–11)—and also spiritual, eternal things. These include the breaking-off and forgiveness of sin (Daniel 4[:27]), cleansing (Luke 11:41), perpetual righteousness (Psalm 112:9), a treasure safe in heaven (Luke 12:33 and 18:22), entry into the heavenly tabernacle (Luke 16:9), the possession and inheritance of life eternal (Matthew 25[:34])—and that by God's righteousness (Hebrews 6:10). 37

In these promises almsgiving is not established as the cause* of such great goods, but as their antecedent, because these goods happen to such people, and the explanation of their origin arises not from cause but from effect, or from the proper adjunct,[26] and if some reason* as a cause is indicated, it is done not by itself but by accident,* with respect to the conjunction of this love with faith, and to God's reckoning. For, in fact, hearts are cleansed by faith (Acts 15:9). The remission of sins, the washing-away, and life eternal are merits of Christ, and life eternal is a gift from God, and the inheritance of sons is from God, and is traced to God's good pleasure (Luke 12:32; Matthew 25). 38

25 Dutch academies and synods of the Reformed church in the sixteenth and seventeenth century assumed a similar position to this collection of sources by Gisbertus Voetius, Carolus De Maets, and Johannes Hoornbeeck shows: *Res judicata, dat is: Extracten uyt de resolutien der synoden, ende oordelen der academien in dese Vereenichde Nederlanden over de negotie der ghenaemde lombarden* (Utrecht: Johannes van Waesberge, 1646). See also Voetius's two-part disputation "De usuris" and its appendix "De trapezitis," in Gisbertus Voetius, *Selectae disputationes theologicae* (Utrecht: Johannes van Waesberge, 1648–1667) 4:555–589. Cf. Van Asselt, "'A Grievous Sin'," 509–516; Beck, *Gisbertus Voetius*, 97–98.

26 For the term 'proper adjunct' see *SPT* 33.35, note 19.

DE JEJUNIO ET VIGILIIS.

XXXIX Huc usque de Eleemosyna: sequitur alterum Precationi singulariter susceptae adjunctum, ejusque saepe comes, *Religiosum Jejunium*, quod est rigidioris disciplinae species,* seu actus* a Deo in genere praescriptus, secundum vero circumstantias liber, quo fidelis firmior, orandi insigniore oblata et urgente necessitate, ab omni cibo, et potu, omnique vitae solito apparatu, ultra consuetum, et ad certum tempus, quantum naturae* vires ferunt, minimum interdiu, abstinet, ad excitandum juvandumque in oratione animum spiritumque, maxime autem in humiliatione nostra coram Deo, cum peccatorum poenitentia, ex fide vera, privatim vel publice, religiose susceptum ac observatum.

XL *Religiosum Jejunium* cum dicimus, sejungimus ab eo *Naturale*,* quod ad corporis valetudinem tuendam aut recuperandam suscipitur; Item *Civile*, cum intenti alicui negotio, et in difficultate constituti refectionem debitam defugimus, 1 Sam. 14, 24. Act. 23, 14. et 27, 33. Quin et *coactum, et necessarium*, ut est fames, et inedia, ac cibi et potus penuria, divinitus aut humanitus injecta, Matt. 24, 7. 2 Cor. 11, 27. Intelligimus itaque illud quod religionis* ergo suscipitur.

XLI Neque tamen huc proprie* spectat *sobrietas, frugalitas, ac victus temperantia*, omnibus fidelibus toto vitae curriculo imperata, Rom. 13, 13. Luc. 21, 34. 1 Pet. 5. Quae ut quotidiana et perpetua, ita improprie* jejunium est; nec etiam secundum singularem vocationem *vitae peculiaris, tenuitas et austeritas*, et jejunandi crebritas, qualis Johannis Baptistae, cui haud communis* cum aliis victus ratio fuit, ut qui, praeterquam quod a cibis vulgaribus abstineret, multum jejunabat, Matt. 3, 4. et 9, 14. quod *jejunium extraordinarium est*; neque

On Fasting and Vigils

Thus far, then, about almsgiving. What follows is a second thing that is 39
related to prayer conducted on special occasions, and is its frequent companion, namely, religious fasting,[27] which is a more rigorous sort* of self-discipline, or act* which God prescribes in general that is voluntary in its circumstances whereby a stronger believer, because a more important and urgent need to pray arose, abstains from all food and drink, and all the customary trappings of life, beyond what is usual and for a certain period of time—as long as the natural* strengths permit—at least for a day, in order to arouse and assist the soul and spirit in prayer, but that is especially undertaken and done religiously in humbling ourselves before God with repentance for sins, out of true faith, and either privately or publicly.

In calling it 'religious fasting' we distinguish it from the 'natural* fasting' that 40
is done for the purpose of maintaining or recovering bodily health. And we distinguish it from 'civil fasting,' which is when we are focused on some business or other, find ourselves in trouble, and we shun the needed refreshment (1 Samuel 14:24; Acts 23:14, and 27:33). And it is different also from 'forced and necessary fasting,' such as hunger, famine, and lack of food and drink, whether it is brought on by God or human beings (Matthew 24:7; 2 Corinthians 11:27). And so what we mean is the fasting that is done for religious* reasons.

And yet what does not properly* come into consideration here are sobri- 41
ety, frugality, and moderation in the standard of living, as they are commanded to all believers throughout the entire course of their lives (Romans 13:13; Luke 21:34; 1 Peter 5). And as moderation is daily and lifelong, so also it is not properly* considered fasting. Also not strictly fasting is the poverty, austerity or frequent fasting that is done according to a special calling for a particular lifestyle, such as that of John the Baptist, whose lifestyle was not at all common* with others, since he fasted many times—besides the fact that he abstained from everyday foods (Matthew 3:4 and 9:14). This is 'extraordinary fasting.' And also not relevant here is 'miraculous fasting' that comes by the special working of

27 In this second part Thysius first discusses the definition of fasting (theses 39–41), then he draws up and discusses four propositions regarding fasting: [1] It is not self-willed, but is an abiding God-given ordinance (thesis 42); [2] its practice is free and circumstantial (theses 43–47) and therefore it is not tied to specific times or days (thesis 46); nor is the observance binding on one's conscience (thesis 47); [3] it consists in a restraint or abstinence (thesis 48–49), and [4] in and of itself it is non-essential (thesis 50). He then treats the goals of fasting (theses 51–53), its mode (theses 54–55), some of its results (thesis 56), and finally he discusses vigils (theses 58–59).

denique ex singulari divina efficacia *miraculosum jejunium*, quale Mosis, Exod. 24, 18. et 34. Eliae, 1 Reg. 19. Christi, Matt. 4. adeoque inimitabile.

XLII De Religioso ergo illo Jejunio omnibus fidelibus communi,* ex definitione haec colligimus Theoremata. Primum est, *Quod Jejunii ipsius usus non est ἐθελοθρησκεία, seu spontaneus cultus, sed res** *divinae institutionis, et observantiae et disciplinae perpetuo in Ecclesia duraturae*, Joel. 1, 14. et 2, 15. Matt. 6, 16. et 9, 15. Ac proinde, retento tantum metaphorico et spirituali, scilicet abstinentia a peccatis, (ita ut jejunet os, non a cibo, sed a verbis* turpibus, et morsu ac maledicentia proximi, manus a rapina, pedes ab omni re* illicita, oculi ab impudicitia, aures ab obtrectatione et calumnia, etc. Esa. 58, 6. Jerem. 14, 12. Zach. 7, 5.) illud *externum et corporale*, cum reliquis legis ceremoniis in Nov. Test. antiquatum non est.

XLIII *Ita tamen Divinae est institutionis, ut universim quidem, at liberae sit secundum circumstantias dispositionis*. Verum in V. Test. *unum tantum* ex divina praescriptione[a] *statum et ordinarium seu anniversarium fuit*, quod decima septimi mensis festo expiationis die, in domo Domini solenniter quotannis, usque in vesperam celebrabatur, Lev. 16. et 23. Ex institutione vero *Ecclesiae* in captivitate Babylonica existentis, fuit Jejunium decimi mensis in memoriam obsessae, quarti expugnatae, quinti desolatae urbis Jerusalem, septimi denique caedis Godoliae, quam multae calamitates consecutae sunt, 2 Reg. 25. Jer. 52. Zach. 5, 3. et 8, 19. Quibus accedit a Mardochaeo institutum, et a Judaeis susceptum *jejunium Estherae*, Esth. 9, 31. 32. Quorum illud, ut ceremoniale, haec vero ut temporalia, et genti illi pro tempore propria, abrogata sunt, Zach. 8, 19.

XLIV In Novo vero Test. nullum omnino *certum jejunii tempus* a Christo et Apostolis est definitum, sed liberum relictum, ut idem testatur August. Epist. 86.[b] Illudque usurpandum, ut loquuntur apud Tertull. Lib. de Jejunio Orthodoxi, *indifferenter ex arbitrio,** *non ex imperio novae disciplinae, pro temporibus et causis uniuscujusque*, id est, pro ratione personae firmioris; temporis, plurimum luctus; rei, incidentis et urgentis, gravioris alicujus sc. necessitatis, Matt. 9, 15. Marc. 2, 20. Luc. 5, 34. publicae vel privatae, praesentis vel imminentis; et

[a] descriptione: 1642. [b] Augustine, *Ep*. 36.11 (= *Ep*. 86 in old numbering; CSEL 34:54–55).

God—such as that of Moses (Exodus 24:18 and 34[:28]), Elijah (1 Kings 19[:4 and 5]), and Christ (Matthew 4[:2])—and that thus cannot be imitated.[28]

Therefore concerning religious fasting that is common* to all believers we 42
draw up the following propositions from its definition. [1)] The first is that the practice of fasting as such is not self-willed or spontaneous worship, but something* that has been established by God and that has been observed and a rule that will be exercised forever in the church (Joel 1:14 and 2:15; Matthew 6:16 and 9:15). Accordingly, the outward, bodily fasting was not made obsolete in the New Testament along with the other ceremonies of the law, as if it retained only a figurative and spiritual meaning—that is, abstinence from sin, so that the mouth 'fasts' not from food but from base words,* and from devouring and cursing one's neighbor; so that the hand 'fasts' from theft, the feet from every unlawful thing,* and the eyes from what is not chaste, and the ears from disparaging slander, etc. (Isaiah 58:6; Jeremiah 14:12; Zechariah 7:5).

[2)] But this divine ordinance is of such nature that while it is indeed gen- 43
eral, it is of a free disposition according to circumstances. In fact in the Old Testament there was only one fixed and regular, annual fasting by divine prescription: on the tenth day of the seventh month before the feast of Atonement, in the house of the Lord every year there would be a solemn fast, and it was celebrated until evening (Leviticus 16 and 23). And by institution of the Church, dwelling in the Babylonian captivity, there was a fasting in the tenth month, to commemorate the siege of the city of Jerusalem, one in the fourth month for the city's capture, in the fifth for its destruction, and lastly, in the seventh month for the slaughter of Gedeliah that was followed by many disasters (2 Kings 25; Jeremiah 52; Zechariah 5:3 and 8:19). Added to these is the fast initiated by Mordecai, the one taken up by the Jews for the 'fast of Esther' (Esther 9:31–32). These have been abolished, the former for being ceremonial, and the latter ones for being temporary, appropriate for that people during particular period (Zechariah 8:19).

But in the New Testament Christ and his apostles did not set any certain 44
time at all for fasting, but left it free, as also Augustine testifies (Epistle 86). And that fasting should be used (as the Orthodox state in Tertullian's book *On Fasting*) in a manner that is indifferent, by personal decision,* and not by the order of a new discipline, and suited to everyone's time and cause—that is, suited to the degree of strength of each person.[29] As to the time, mostly a time of mourning; as to the occasion, one that befalls and presses, one of a graver necessity (Matthew 9:15; Mark 2:20; Luke 5:34), whether public or

28 On the rejection of Lent for this reason see thesis 47 below.

29 See also thesis 50 below.

quidem spiritualis vel corporalis boni obtinendi, vel mali avertendi causa, idque sine superstitiosa temporis ac dierum observatione.

XLV Unde a causa* et observatione jejunii, *aliud privatum, aliud publicum*. Illud quod privatim in privata causa, vel sua vel alterius initur, Dan. 9, 3. et 10, 3. 1 Cor. 7, 5. Act. 10, 30. Hoc, quod in publica, ab Ecclesiae antistitibus indicitur, et publice observatur, Esdr. 8, 21. Act. 13, 2. 3. et 14, 23.

XLVI Quare Pontificii graviter hic errant, qui contra Christianam libertatem, jejunia ad certa tempora et dies alligarunt, ac ultra Judaismum Ecclesiam sine ulla urgente causa, multis statisque jejuniis onerarunt, et observationis quasi necessaria lege conscientias devinxerunt; utpote *hebdomadatim*, jejunio quartae et sextae feriae, itemque post (imprimis in Romana Ecclesia) Sabbathi; *annuatim* Quadragesimae et Quinquagesimae (solis nempe Clericis) ante Pascha imposito; quin et *quatuor temporum*, scilicet mense Martio, Junio, Septembri, Decembri; aliisque quam plurimis, ut in vigiliis Apostolorum et aliorum Sanctorum solenniorum.

XLVII Horum quaedam, scilicet *hebdomadaria*, et *quatuor temporum*, ex Judaica consuetudine, causa* tantum mutata, ortum ducunt, Luc. 18, 12. Zach. 7. *Quadragesimale* vero, inani et inepta κακοζηλίᾳ miraculosi jejunii Christi, quod mirandum potius quam imitandum, inductum est. Quod quamvis ab Ecclesia antiqua usurpatum sit, varie tamen et libere, ita ut magna hujus, et in tempore, et in observatione fuerit diversitas et dissimilitudo, unius scilicet, duorum, plurium et quadraginta dierum. Euseb. lib. 5. cap. 26.[a] Socrat. lib. 5. cap. 21.[b] Niceph.

[a] This seems to be a mistake. The correct reference is Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* 5.24.12 (SC 41:70). [b] Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica* 5.22 (SC 505:224–229).

private, present or looming. And it should be done for the sake of obtaining some spiritual or bodily good, or for the sake of averting evil, and without the superstitious observance of time and days.

Accordingly, it follows from the reason* for and keeping of fasting, that some 45
are private, others public. The former is undertaken privately in a matter that is personal, either for oneself or for another (Daniel 9:3 and 10:3; 1 Corinthians 7:5; Acts 10:30). The latter is done in public and is proclaimed by the overseers of the church, and kept publicly (Ezra 8:21; Acts 13:2–3 and 14:23).

And therefore the papal teachers are making a serious mistake, who contrary 46
to Christian liberty,[30] tie fasting to specific times and days, and, outdoing Judaism, have burdened the church with many fixed fastings for no pressing reason, and they bind the consciences to observe them as if by a required law—such as weekly, by fasting on the fourth and sixth day of the week [i.e. Wednesday and Friday]; and likewise on the Saturday after that (especially in the Roman church).[31] So too the imposed annual fasting at the forty days of Lent and (only for clerics) from the fiftieth day before Easter; and also the fasting of the four seasons (March, June, September, and December), and very many other ones, like the yearly Vigils for the feasts of the Apostles and the other saints.[32]

Some of these, namely the weekly fasting and the four Ember days, derive 47
their origins from Jewish custom, and have been changed only in their reason* (Luke 18:12; Zechariah 7). The one for Lent, however, was introduced as a vain, foolish, poor imitation of Christ's miraculous fasting, which we should marvel at but not copy. And although the ancient church did employ it, yet it varied and was free, so much so that there was a great diversity and dissimilarity both in its duration and its observance—one, two, several, and forty days (Eusebius, [*Ecclesiastical History*,] book 5, chapter 26; Socrates, [*Ecclesiastical*

30 On Roman Catholic ceremonies that conflict with Christian liberty see also *SPT* 35.26 and 49.

31 Fasting on Saturday (Sabbath) was already in antiquity subject of discussion between the Eastern and Western churches. See Radiša Antic, "The Controversy over Fasting on Saturday between Constantinople and Rome," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 49.2 (2011), 337–352.

32 Already the *Didache* (first half second century CE) mentions Wednesdays and Fridays as days of fasting. The Ember days, seasonal three-day fasts, were observed in the West as of late antiquity and only abolished by pope Paul VI in 1966. The forty-day fast of Lent was (and is) compulsory for all Catholics, and clerics had to begin earlier. Fasting was also prescribed on the vigils of Christmas, Pentecost, Assumption, feasts of the Apostles (esp. Peter and Paul) and of St. Lawrence and John the Baptist. Cf. Patrick Michael J. Clancy, "Fast and Abstinence," *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 2nd ed. (Detroit: Gale, 2003), 5:632–635.

lib. 1. cap. 34.[a] At Pontificii ejus observationem necessariam et in conscientia obligatoriam faciunt.

XLVIII *Consistit vero in fraudatione genii, et solito severiore continentia, seu abstinentia omnis omnino cibi, et potus, eaque intra vires humanas, puta, consuete a vespera ad vesperam*, Lev. 23, 32. imo *continuo usque ad triduum*, Esth. 4, 16. vel a *mane in vesperam*, maxime in plurium dierum jejunio, ut *septem dierum*, 1Sam. 31. 13. *trium hebdomadarum*, Dan. 10, 2. Ubi vespere cibum sumebant, sed parce ac tenuiter. Sic Daniel a carne et vino, quin et a pane delicioso, sed libere, abstinuit, Dan. 10, 3.

XLIX Proinde Pontificii nihil minus quam jejunant, ut qui *Primo* jejunium non tam definiunt abstinentia ab omni cibo et potu, quam inepte superstitioso *discrimine et delectu ciborum*, 1Tim. 4, 1. 2. 3. seu carnis; atque in Quadragesima omnium, quae a carne originem habent, ut lactis, butyri, casei, ovorum (quibus se fieri immundos putant) abstinentia; ac contra *piscium* saepe aromatis bene conditorum; aut *fructuum* deliciosissimorum, in quibus maximae cupediae; aut *leguminum*, in quibus magna flatulentia, etiam copiosiore usu: non item *vini aut potus inebriantis*, in quorum largiore usu luxuria est, continentia. *Deinde* neque carentia cibi et potus toto die, sed prandii dilatione semel tantum singulis diebus ventrem saturantes, quod plerique Veteres tota vita

[a] Nicephorus Callistus, *Ecclesiasticae historia* 12.34 (MPL 146:853–865).

History,] book 5, chapter 21; Nicephorus,[33] [*Refutation and Overthrowing of the Definition of the Synod of 815*,] book 1, chapter 34). But the papal teachers make the observance of fasting necessary and binding upon the conscience.

[3)] Fasting consists in the cheating of the natural appetite,[34] in a restraint 48
that is more severe than is customary, or in an abstinence from all food and drink altogether, as much as our human powers permit—for instance, usually from one evening until another evening (Leviticus 23:32), but sometimes it continues until the third day (Esther 4:16). Or from morning until evening, especially in a fast of many days, like a week (1 Samuel 31:13), or three weeks (Daniel 10:2) when in the evening they ate food, but only a little, and sparingly. In this way Daniel abstained from meat and wine, and even tasty bread—but he did so freely (Daniel 10:3).

And furthermore the papal teachers do not fast at all, since in the first place 49
they define fasting not so much by abstinence from all food and drink as by the foolishly superstitious discrimination and selection of foods (1 Timothy 4:1–3) or of meat. And at Lent it is abstaining from everything that comes from an animal; for example, milk, butter, cheese, eggs (whereby they think they become unclean). And by contrast, [it consists of] the use and even greater use of fish (often well-seasoned with spices), or very tasty fruits, including the most dainty delicacies; or of legumes that produce much flatulence. And it likewise consists in not being self-restrained in the drinking of wine or spirits, whereof they make extravagantly abundant use. And then also they fast not by abstaining from food and drink for the whole day, but they still fill their stomachs every day while postponing breakfast only once, which very many of the ancients sought to do their whole lives.[35] And they foist this law upon

33 Nicephorus I (c. 758–828) was Patriarch of Constantinople. He wrote a chronological survey of history from Adam to his own time, with an important appendix on the canon. His main works are against iconoclasm, one of which is his refutation of the iconoclastic synod of 815.

34 'Cheating one's appetite' (*suum defraudans genium*) is a proverbial phrase taken from the comedy Phormio by the Latin playwrite Terence (second century BC): Loeb Classical Library 23:16.

35 Abstaining from meat has always been one of the basic rules for fasting in the Roman Catholic Church, but more specific regulations differed over time and place. Milk, eggs, butter and cheese were usually also forbidden, while wine was allowed. "Legumes that produce much flatulence" are mentioned by Thomas Aquinas in his explanation of why meat is forbidden but wine and vegetables not (*Summa theologiae* 2/2.147.8.1); it has to do with specific medieval theories on body fluids and gases and their influence on one's temper. On a fast day, often only one meal was taken after Vespers, in the afternoon. The practice of selling papal dispensations for fasting observance increased by the end of the

factitabant. Atque hanc legem conscientiis, ut necessariam imponunt, nec nisi accepta pecunia dispensant.

L Denique, *per se res* media, et indifferens est, id est, per se nec bona, nec mala; non enim regnum Dei est cibus aut potus, sed justitia et gaudium per Spiritum Sanctum*, Rom. 14, 6. 17. 1 Cor. 8, 8. *In usu vero; proprie* et primo externum seu corporale exercitium et adminiculum* est, excitandae, alendae, et fovendae pietatis; ac poenitentiae signum, quod *per se* non aut parum sane prodest, Col. 2, 23. 1 Tim. 4, 8. sed *per accidens** praestantioris finis* respectu, quatenus scilicet ad pietatem, preces et poenitentiam refertur. Unde commendatur relatum ad justitiam, Matt. 5, 6.

LI *Finis** itaque est, *ut hac inedia carnis lascivia et torpedine coërcita, animus spiritusque disponatur, et excitetur, ut* liberior, expeditior et ardentior solito reddatur, ad Deo supplicandum, sanctas meditationes suscipiendas, et preces, quam ordinarie efficaciores, effundendas. Hinc est quod in Scriptura frequenter *Orationi Jejunium* adjungatur, Joel. 1, 14. Neh. 1, 4. Matt. 6, 5. Luc. 2, 37. 1 Cor. 7, 5. etiam extra rationem singularis poenitentiae, Act. 13, 2.

LII Maxime autem illustris ejus *finis* in precatione hominis poenitentis*, ad afflictionem carnis, et totius hominis coram Deo humiliationem, Psal. 35, 13. ut sit testimonium* et symbolum seriae poenitentiae, et veri doloris ob peccatum concepti, Joel. 2, 12. Unde etiam Jejunium afflictio dicitur, et affligere se, corpus, animam, pro jejunare accipitur, Lev. 16, 29. Esai. 58, 3. Esd. 8, 21. et 9, 5. Res itaque fere est luctus, et luctui opportuna, Matt. 9, 15. Ut *contra in sollemnitatibus* cum gaudio et laetitia, largius, et ad hilaritatem sumere, et pauperibus portiones mittere, atque hilaria agere coram Domino, ad testandam gratiarum actionem, consuetum erat, Psal. 116, 13. Zach. 8, 19. Esd. 6, 21. 22. Neh. 8, 11. 13.

LIII Illi rei olim varios *gestus ac ritus*, contritionis ac doloris indices, adhibebant, ut *scissionem vestimentorum* Joel. 2, 12. 13. *vestem lugubrem*, ut sacci vel cilicii, Psal. 35, 13. *sessionem et abjectionem in terram* ac cineres eorumque in caput aspersionem, *faciei sordidationem* et obscurationem, 2 Sam. 12, 16. *lotionis et unctionis carentiam*, Matt. 6, 16. *capitis incurvationem*, 1 Reg. 21, 27. Esai 58, 5. *effusionem aquae*, 1 Sam. 7, 6. *evulsionem capillorum et barbae*, Esd. 9, 3. Ester.

---

fifteenth century under pope Alexander VI: see Ken Albala, "The Ideology of Fasting in the Reformation Era," in *Food and Faith in Christian Culture*, ed. Ken Albala and Trudy Eden (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011), 41–85.

the people's consciences, as a necessary law, nor do they grant an exemption to this, unless upon receipt of money.

[4)] And finally, in and of itself fasting is a 'middle thing,'* and indifferent;[36] 50
that is, by itself it is neither something good nor something evil. "For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit" (Romans 14:6, 17; 1 Corinthians 8:8). But in its use, fasting is properly* and foremost an outward or bodily exercise, and an aid for training, nurturing and fostering piety. And it is a mark of penitence, that in and of itself is of no, or very little, advantage (Colossians 2:23; 1 Timothy 4:8). But it is advantageous by accident* with a view to a more excellent goal,* insofar as it concerns piety, prayer, and repentance. For this reason the recommendation to fast is related to righteousness (Matthew 5:6).

And so the goal* of fasting is that, after our wanton and languid flesh has 51
been halted by this lack of food, our heart and soul become so disposed and incited that they are rendered more free, unencumbered, and zealous than usual to offer prayer unto God, to undertake spiritual meditation, and to pour out prayers that are more efficacious than ordinarily. Hence Scripture often links fasting with prayer (Joel 1:14; Nehemiah 1:4; Matthew 6:5; Luke 2:37; 1 Corinthians 7:5), even apart from the link to special penitence (Acts 13:2).

The highest goal,* however, is in the penitent's prayer, for the affliction of 52
the flesh and for humbling the entire man before God (Psalm 35:13), so that it becomes a testimony* and symbol of serious repentance and of true grief arising over sin (Joel 2:12). For this reason fasting is also called an affliction; and the statements 'to afflict oneself or one's body or soul' is used for fasting (Leviticus 16:29; Isaiah 58:3; Ezra 8:21 and 9:5). And therefore the cause is usually grief, and an occasion for grief (Matthew 9:15). And so contrariwise, in times of formal festivities it was the custom with joy and delight to eat more lavishly, and with pleasure, and to deliver portions to the poor, and in the presence of the Lord to have pleasure, as a testimony to their thanksgiving (Psalm 116:13; Zechariah 8:19; Ezra 6:21–22; Nehemiah 8:11,13).

In former times people added to that fasting a variety of gestures and ritual 53
actions to indicate their contrition and grief. These included the tearing of garments (Joel 2:12–13), wearing clothes of mourning like sackcloth and *cilicium*[37] (Psalm 35:13), being seated or cast down in dirt and ashes and sprinkling these on one's head, befouling and hiding one's face (2 Samuel 12:16), neglecting to wash and anoint oneself (Matthew 6:16), bending one's head downward (1 Kings 21:27; Isaiah 58:5), pouring out water (1 Samuel 7:6), pulling out one's hair and

36 On 'indifferent' or 'middle things,' see *SPT* 35.32, note 32.

37 The *cilicium* was a cloak made of goat's hair; see *SPT* 32.50, note 43.

4, 3. *fletum*, planctum et ululatum, Joel. 2, 12. Quin et *infantes et pecudes* in graviore luctu in jejunii societatem vocabantur, Joel. 2, 16. Jon. 3, 7. Quae fere omnia, vel communia Judaeis cum Orientalibus, aut illi genti propria fuerunt, aut ad paedagogiam illius populi spectabant, a quibus Christus suos, pro re, loco, ac tempore liberos fecit.

LIV Ex hisce finibus* elucet, et cum iis cohaeret *Jejunii modus,** scilicet, *ut non fiat hypocritice et ambitiose*, id est, cum externa apparentia, gloriatione et affectatione famae sanctitatis, Matt. 6, 16. 17. Itemque *superstitiose*, id est, ex consuetudine, et in honorem Sanctorum, sed cum fide, Rom. 14. Dei timore, proximi caritate, et ad Dei gloriam.

LV Hisce finibus* et modo* susceptum et usurpatum, Deo placet, *ut usu bonum opus*; ac sine eis, quantamcunque afflictionem et corporis castigationem adjunctam habeat, Deo displicet. Unde Deus imprimis urget ejus loco *Jejunium spirituale*, cum quo illud conjungendum, et ex hoc censendum est, Esa. 58, 5. 6. Zach. 7, 5. 9.

LVI Cui quidem secundum rationem adjuncti, puta orationis fidei, id est, ex fide factae, et cum resipiscentia conjunctae, tribuitur *deprecatio irae Dei*, Deut. 9, 18. Jon. 3, 9. *merces et retributio* a Deo, Matt. 6, 18. Quin respectu humiliationis qualiscunque, affert et *mitigationem poenae temporalis*, 1 Reg. 21, 27. 28. 29. Imo et *efficacia ejectionis daemoniorum* ei attribuitur, Matt. 17, 20, 21.

LVII Quare graviter errant *Pontificii*, qui vel in speciem tantum jejunantes, vel nimia inedia animum dejicientes, jejunium, seu inanitatem hanc ventris et intestinorum, atque hanc afflictionem et castigationem corporis, *per se cultum Dei bonumque opus esse asseverant*, illud gratam Deo orationem reddere, satisfactorium pro peccatis, meritorium justitiae et vitae aeternae, seu placare iram Dei, hominem justificare coram Deo; quin imo solvi eo animas e purgatorio, Lomb. L. 4. c. 15.[a] contra evidentia* Scripturae testimonia* ante a nobis Thesi. 50. et 55. allata.

[a] Lombard, *Sententiae* 4.15.

beard (Ezra 9:3; Esther 14:2),[38] weeping, wailing, and howling (Joel 2:12). In fact, in more serious times of grief even children and herds were called to join the fasting (Joel 2:16; Jonah 3:7). The Jewish nation either shared nearly all these things with the peoples of the near East, or they were proper to that nation, or those things were meant for the pedagogical teaching of that people.[39] Christ liberated his people from them, in keeping with the thing, place, and time.

What is clear from these goals* (and connected to them) is the mode* of 54
fasting: it should not be done hypocritically or for reasons of ambition, i.e., with an outward appearance, boasting, or pretense for the reputation of being holy (Matthew 6:16–17). Nor should it be done superstitiously, i.e., out of habit and to honor saints; but with faith, fear of God, and love for the neighbor, and to God's glory.

When it is undertaken and done in this way* for these goals,* fasting pleases 55
God, as a work that is good to do. Without these goals, however, fasting displeases God—no matter how much affliction and chastisement of the body accompanies it. It is for this reason that God especially urges spiritual fasting in place of it, as it should be part of the physical fasting, and the physical fasting should be valued by the spiritual one (Isaiah 58:5–6; Zechariah 7:5,9).

Because fasting is linked to something else—i.e., to the prayer of faith, that is, 56
made out of faith and accompanied by repentance—the prayer for the aversion of God's wrath is attributed to fasting (Deuteronomy 9:18; Jonah 3:9), and also the reward and retribution by God (Matthew 6:18). And moreover, in view of some sort of self-humbling, fasting also brings about a decrease of temporal punishment (1 Kings 21:27–29). In fact, even the power to cast out demons is ascribed to fasting (Matthew 17:20–21).

And therefore the papal teachers are making a serious mistake, for when 57
they fast either for appearance's sake or become depressed in their hearts from their excessive abstinence, they make the claim that fasting or this emptiness of the stomach and intestines, and this bodily affliction is in itself a form of worship to God and a good work; that it renders their prayer pleasing to God, is satisfactory for sins, meritorious of righteousness and eternal life, and also appeases the wrath of God, justifies man in God's presence. In fact they claim that by it even souls are set free from Purgatory (Lombard, [*Sentences*,] book 4, chapter 15). All this is contrary to the obvious* testimony* of Scripture that we produced earlier in theses 50 and 55.

---

38 The reference is to the Septuagint and Vulgate, where it says that Esther "covered her head with ashes and dung, and she humbled her body greatly, and all the places of her joy she filled with her torn hair."

39 In Galatians 3:24–25 the law is called a schoolmaster (*paidagōgos*).

LVIII Sub Jejunio comprehenditur *et Vigilia* quae et ipsa cum precibus saepe conjungitur, Matt. 26, 38. 41. 1 Pet. 4, 7. qua non modo *Vigilia cordis animique*, qua semper ad preces, et adventum Domini parati et expediti sumus, Matt. 24, 42. Marc. 13, 35. Luc. 12, 39. 1 Thess. 5, 6. Apoc. 3, 3. et 16, 15. securitati carnali opposita, intelligitur; sed *et corporis, qua* libere, pro necessitate pars aliqua de nocte detrahitur, ad precationem, et meditationem adventus Domini. Sic David de se testatur, Psal. 119, 55. 62. Christus praeivit, Luc. 6, 12. confirmant Apostoli, Coloss. 4, 2. Actor. 16, 25. scilicet ut praecaveamus, ne intremus in tentationem, Matt. 26, 38. 41.

LIX Ea non solum *privata, sed et publica et stata* olim fuit, in Paschalibus Vigiliis, scilicet nocte ante diem Resurrectionis, quae pervigilio celebrabantur, luminibus et publice et privatim accensis, Ambros. Serm. 60.[a] *In Paschalis Sabbatho jejunamus, Vigilias celebramus, et Orationibus percunctanter insistimus*, scilicet ut Lactant. Lib. 7. cap. 19.[b] et Hieron.[c] causam reddunt, *quod ea nocte Christi judicis exspectarent adventum*. Sed eam rem pro Christiana libertate, ut libere susceptam usurpatamque, ita libere quoque antiquavit vetus Ecclesia.

LX Ac tantum de Jejunio: *Bacchanalia* vero, quae ante jejunium Quadragesimale, in morem gentilem, improba consuetudine observantur a Pontificiis, qui extraordinaria lascivia, et luxu initiant hoc suum jejunium Quadragesimale, ab omnibus Christianis execranda et vitanda omnino sunt.

August. in Enchirid. ad Laur. c. 75.[d]

Sane qui sceleratissime vivunt, nec curant talem vitam moresque corrigere, et inter ipsa facinora et flagitia sua eleemosynas frequentare non cessant, frustra sibi ideo blandiuntur, quoniam Dominus ait, Date eleemosynam, et ecce, omnia munda sunt vobis. *Hoc enim quam late pateat, non intelligunt, etc. Itane hoc intellecturi sumus, ut Pharisaeis non habentibus fidem Christi, etiamsi non crediderint, nec renati fuerint ex aqua et Spiritu Sancto, munda sint omnia, si tantum eleemosynas dederint, sicut isti illas dandas putant? cum sint immundi omnes quos non mundat fides Christi, de qua scriptum est*, Mundans fide corda eorum; *et dicat Apostolus*, Immundis autem et infidelibus nihil est mundum, sed polluta sunt ipsorum mens et conscientia, etc. *Nemo autem dat eleemosynam quamlibet, nisi unde det, ab illo accipiat qui non eget et ideo dictum est*, Misericordia ejus praeveniet me.

---

[a] Ambrose, *Opera omnia*, vol. 3 (Basel, 1527), 361. This sermon is no longer attributed to Ambrose. Migne lists it among the *Homilies* (LXII) of Maximus of Turin (PL 57:373–378); cf. CCSL 23:160–162. [b] Lactantius, *Institutiones divinae* 7.19 (CSEL 19/1:644–645). [c] Jerome, *Commentariorum in Matheum libri IV* [ad Mt 25:6] (CCSL 77:237). [d] Augustine, *Enchiridion* 20 (CCSL 46:89–90).

Vigils are also included under fasting, and they, too, are often combined with 58
prayers (Matthew 26:38, 41; 1 Peter 4:7). And by 'vigils' are meant not only the vigils of the heart and soul, whereby we are always readied and equipped for prayer and for the Lord's coming, in contrast with the security in the flesh (Matthew 24:42; Mark 13:35; Luke 12:39; 1 Thessalonians 5:6; Revelation 3:3 and 16:15). But included also are the bodily vigils, whereby we freely take some portion of the night (as needed) to pray and meditate on the Lord's coming. This is what David testifies about himself (Psalm 119:55, 62), and Christ led the way in doing (Luke 6:12), and the apostles reinforce (Colossians 4:2; Acts 16:25)—namely, that we should keep watch lest we enter into temptation (Matthew 26:38, 41).

In former times vigils were both a private and a public, fixed institution. 59
The vigils of Easter, that is, in the night before the day of Resurrection, were celebrated by keeping watch throughout the night, with lights burning in both public and private places. Ambrose (Sermon 60) writes: "We fast on the Easter Sabbath, we celebrate the vigils, and we conduct prayers constantly;" and the reason that Lactantius ([*Divine Institutes*,] book 7, chapter 19) and Jerome give is: "Because it was on that night that they expected Christ to return as Judge." But, in keeping with Christian freedom, the ancient Church made this vigil obsolete as freely as it had been undertaken and kept.

So much for fasting. As for the Bacchanals that are celebrated before Lent 60
by the Roman Catholics after the manner of the gentiles according to an evil custom, all Christians should detest and avoid them altogether, as the papists start this Lenten-fast of theirs with immoderate licentiousness and luxury.

Augustine, *Enchiridion addressed to Laurentius*, chapter 75

Now, surely, those who live very heinous lives and are not concerned about correcting their lives and habits, and who nevertheless amid their crimes and misdeeds continue multiplying their almsgiving, flatter themselves vainly with these words of the Lord: "Give alms; and, behold, all things are clean to you." They do not understand how far this saying reaches, etc. Should we interpret this to mean that to the Pharisees, who did not have the faith in Christ, all things are clean so long as they give alms (as they think they should be given), even though they have not believed and have not been reborn of water and the Holy Spirit? But all are unclean who are not made clean by the faith in Christ, of which it is written: "Cleansing their hearts by faith" [Acts 15:9]. And as the apostle said: "But to those who are unclean and to unbelievers nothing is clean; both their minds and consciences are unclean, etc." But no-one, however, gives any alms at all unless he gives from Him who does not need anything. Accordingly it says: "His mercy shall go before me." [Psalm 59:10]

Idem ad Casulanum, Epist. 86.[a]

*Ego in Evangelicis et Apostolicis literis, totoque instrumento quod appellant Testamentum Novum, animo id revolvens, video praeceptum esse jejunium. Quibus autem diebus non oporteat jejunare, et quibus oporteat, praecepto Domini et Apostolorum non invenio definitum.**

[a] Augustine, *Ep.* 36.11 (= *Ep.* 86 in old numbering; CSEL 34:54–55).

Augustine, *Letter* 86 *To Casulanus*[40]

Thinking the matter over in my mind, I observe that in the Gospels and the Epistles, and in the entire document called the New Testament, there is a precept for fasting. But I do not find any rule definitely laid down* by the Lord or by the apostles about which days we should or should not fast.

40 Augustine wrote to the priest Casulanus against a certain Roman, called Urbicus, who had argued that it was obligatory to fast on the Sabbath; see also thesis 44 above.

DISPUTATIO XXXVIII

De Votis

Praeside D. JOHANNE POLYANDRO
Respondente GERHARDO PALUDANO

THESIS I Non minus Deus vota nomen ipsius invocantibus, atque eleemosynas proximo largientibus, quam jejunia verbo suo praescribit. Quocirca disputationibus praecedentibus de Invocatione Dei, Eleemosyna et Jejunio, haec de Votis apte subjungitur.

II Votum, si vocis* etymon spectemus, idem apud Latinos, quod apud Graecos εὐχὴ, atque apud Hebraeos נדר[a] denotat.

III Votum generatim consideratum, est sancta ac religiosa pollicitatio, de rebus* praeceptis vel indifferentibus in nostra potestate positis, soli Deo nostri animi et officii erga eum testandi causa, sponte atque ex fide facta, ad nominis ipsius gloriam, et proximi nostri aedificationem. Quamvis in sacris literis saepius ad res medias restringatur.

IV Etiamsi antiqua atque apud omnes Gentes sit usitata votorum nuncupatio, Deus tamen Israëlis formam eorum soli suo populo Israëlitico olim praescripsit, Levit. 27. Num. 30.

[a] ברך: 1642. This seems to be a mistaken reading.

DISPUTATION 38

On Vows

President: Johannes Polyander
Respondent: Gerhardus Paludanus[1]

In his Word God no less prescribes vows for those who call upon his name and generously give alms to their neighbors than He prescribes fasting. Therefore this disputation about vows is aptly joined to the preceding ones about calling upon God, almsgiving and fasting.[2] 1

If we look to the derivation of the word,* then *votum* ('vow') has the same meaning in Latin as *euchē* in Greek and *neder* in Hebrew. 2

When considered in a general way, a vow is a sacred and religious promise about things* that have been commanded, or about indifferent things that have been placed in our power, for the sake of giving testimony to God alone of our intention and duty towards him, a promise that is made of our own doing, and by faith, for the glory of his name and the upbuilding of our neighbor.[3] In the sacred writings, however, vows are more frequently limited to intermediate things.[4] 3

Although making vows is an ancient practice and was used by all heathen nations, yet it was only to his own Israelite people that the God of Israel once prescribed a pattern for them (Leviticus 27; Numbers 30). 4

---

1 Gerardus Theodorus Paludanus was born c. 1600 in Schiedam and matriculated on April 3, 1618 as an alumnus of the Leiden States College. He defended this disputation in 1623. He was ordained in Middelie, Kwadijk and Hobrede (near Purmerend) in 1624, Katwijk aan den Rijn in 1626 and Delfshaven in 1637; he died in 1670. See Du Rieu, *Album studiosorum*, 135 and Van Lieburg, *Repertorium*, 187.

2 Polyander structures the disputation as follows: etymology of 'vow' (thesis 2), general definition (thesis 3), distinction between lawful and unlawful vows (theses 4–7), several subdivisions of lawful vows (theses 8–22), causes of vows (thesis 23), three circumstances of vows, namely subject, i.e., the one who makes the vows (theses 24–33), material content (theses 34–49), and object, i.e., the one to whom the vow is made (theses 50–51). Next are the internal form of vows (thesis 52) and their goal (thesis 53).

3 Vows belong to the category of oaths, discussed in *SPT* 20 in the context of God's law. Vows are oaths about future things; see also *SPT* 20.20 and 28–46. There is some overlap between the discussions in *SPT* 20 and this disputation.

4 'Intermediate things' is synonymous with 'indifferent things,' mentioned at the beginning of this thesis and 'arbitrary things' mentioned in theses 10, 34 and 37; see also *SPT* 35.33–39.

v Hinc sola Israëlitarum vota fuerunt legitima, ceterarum vero gentium illegitima.

vi Vota legitima sunt, quae soli fiunt Deo Israëlis secundum Legem ipsius, in veritate, judicio ac justitia.

vii Illegitima sunt, quae aut Deo praeterito, ipsius fiunt creaturis, aut ipsi quidem Deo, sed nec soli, nec secundum Legem et rationem ab ipso traditam, at ficte, temere atque injuste.

viii Legitima vota, sunt vel moralia, vel ceremonialia.

ix Vota moralia sunt, quae omnes et singulos homines ad obedientiam decalogo praescriptam obligant.

x Ceremonialia sunt, quae a nonnullis ad pium aliquod opus arbitrarium ac per se indebitum, ex animo religioso suscipiuntur.

xi Vota moralia nobis sunt cum Patribus qui sub Vetere vixerunt Testamento, communia; at ceremonialia, qua typica, illis olim fuerunt propria, cultusque principalis, quem Deus in lege morali efflagitat, adminicula.

xii Etsi opera moralia sint per se ac naturaliter* Deo debita, ad ea tamen praestanda fideles votis suis, tum ordinariis, tum extraordinariis peculiari modo ac vinculo obstringuntur.

xiii Vota ordinaria sunt quibus omnes ac singuli fideles se ad perpetuam cultus divini observationem promissione ac sacramento* devinciunt.

xiv Extraordinaria sunt quae interdum, urgente aliqua necessitate, aut a tota Ecclesia, aut a praecipuis illius membris ad ipsorum et aliorum in vera fide confirmationem renovantur, qualia fuerunt vota populi Israëlitici temporibus Josuae, cap. 24, 23. et Esdrae, cap. 10, 5.

xv Utraque, vel sunt absoluta,* vel hypothetica, seu conditionalia.

xvi Vota absoluta* sunt quae pure et simpliciter absque ulla conditione nuncupantur. Cujusmodi votum fuit Davidis, Psalm. 34, 2. *Benedicam Jehovae omni tempore, laus ejus jugiter erit in ore meo*. Et Ps. 101. *Benignitatem et jus canam tibi, o Jehova! animadvertam via integra, quando venturus sis ad me. Indesinenter ambulabo in integritate animi mei intra domum meam*, etc.

xvii Vota hypothetica sunt, quibus certae conditiones, vel personae, vel temporis, vel loci, vel alius circumstantiae annectuntur. Tale fuit votum Jacobi, Gen. 28, 20. *Si fuerit Deus mecum et servaverit me in via illa qua ego profecturus sum,*

Hence only the vows of the Israelites were lawful, while those of the other nations were unlawful. 5

Lawful vows are those that are made only to the God of Israel, in accordance with his law, in truth, with discernment, and in righteousness. 6

Unlawful vows are ones that either disregard God and are made to his creatures, or that are made to God but not to him alone, or not following the law and manner delivered by him, but falsely, rashly and unjustly. 7

Lawful vows are either moral or ceremonial. 8

Moral vows are those that bind each and every person to the obedience that the Decalogue prescribes. 9

Ceremonial vows are ones that some people make from a religious conviction, for some pious work that is arbitrary and not, in itself, owed. 10

We have the moral vows in common with the fathers who lived in the Old Testament; but ceremonial vows, which are figurative, were specific to them in times gone by, and they were aids of the principal worship that God demands in his moral law. 11

Even though moral works are of themselves, naturally,* owed to God, nevertheless in a special way and by a special bond believers are obliged to fulfill them by means of their vows, both ordinary and extraordinary ones. 12

Ordinary vows are the ones whereby believers one and all bind themselves by promise and a solemn obligation* to the perpetual observance of divine worship.[5] 13

Extraordinary vows are the kind that on occasion, due to some pressing need, are renewed either by the whole Church or its leading members in order to confirm themselves and others in the true faith, like the vows of the Israelite people in the time of Joshua (chapter 24:23) and Ezra (chapter 10:5). 14

Both vows are either absolute* or hypothetical and conditional. 15

Absolute* vows are the pure and simple ones that are declared without any condition. David's vow in Psalm 34:2 was of this kind: "I shall bless Jehovah all the time, and praise of Him will always be in my mouth." And Psalm 101[:1 and 2]: "I shall sing of your love and righteousness, O Jehovah! I shall keep the upright way when will you come to me. Without ceasing I shall walk within my home in uprightness of my heart, etc." 16

Hypothetical vows are the ones to which certain conditions are attached, whether of person, time, place, or some other circumstance. Such was Jacob's vow in Genesis 28:20[–22]: "If God will be with me and watch over me on the 17

5 The Latin has *sacramentum*, which is translated here as 'solemn confirmation,' based on its original secular meaning as the sacred oath of allegiance taken by a Roman soldier. See *SPT* 20.2 and 20.31, note 11. In theses 26 and 27 it has the stricter religious meaning of 'sacrament.'

dederitque mihi panem ad comedendum, et vestimentum ad induendum, reversusque fuero prospere ad domum patris mei, denique fuerit mihi Jehova Deus, tum haec strues lapidum quam disposui, in statuam erit Domini Dei, et quicquid dederis mihi, ejus decimas omnino sum daturus tibi. Et Annae, 1Sam. 1, 11. *Jehova exercituum, si omnino respiciens ad afflictionem ancillae tuae, recordaberis mei et non oblivisceris ancillae tuae, sed dabis ancillae tuae semen masculum, utique dabo ipsum Jehovae omnibus diebus vitae ejus, et novacula non admovebitur capiti ejus.*

XVIII Dividuntur quoque vota in perpetua et temporalia. Illis pii per omnem vitam, his per aliquod vitae tempus se ad rei* votae impletionem obligant. Illius exemplum supra proponitur in Davide, Thesi 16. hujus vero in Paulo, Act. 18, 18.

XIX Quemadmodum preces, quae cum votis plerumque conjunguntur, sic vota interdum fiunt sola mentis ad Deum porrectae conceptione, ut videre est in Anna, 1Sam. 1, 11. interdum oris quoque pronunciatione, ut videre est in populo Israëlitico, Jos. 24, 24.

XX Haec rursum, aut publica sunt, aut privata.

XXI Publica fiunt sollemniter, aut in coetu Civili, ut votum Jephtae, Jud. 11, 31. aut in coetu Ecclesiastico, ut votum Davidis, Ps. 34. et 101.

XXII Privata fiunt seorsim in loco ab aliis remoto, ut votum Jacobi, Gen. 28, 20.

XXIII Causarum* ad vota Deo reddenda impellentium, prima est Dei mandatum, Ps. 76, 11. *Vovete et vota reddite Jehovae Deo vestro, quicumque circumstant illum, afferant munus illi formidabili.*

2. Sanctorum exemplum, Gen. 28, 20. 1Sam. 1, 11.
3. Beneficiorum a Deo acceptorum recordatio, qua David excitatus, *Quid*, inquit, *rependam Jehovae? omnia beneficia ejus superant me. Vota mea Jehovae rependam mox coram populo ejus.*
4. Spes novum aliquod ac peculiare beneficium precibus a Deo postulatum atque exspectatum impetrandi. Qua fultus spe Jacob fecit Deo votum singulare, Gen. 28. quemadmodum et Anna mater Samuëlis, 1Sam. 1.
5. Denique serium animi propositum carnis libidines ab omni pravitate cohibendi. Quale fuit Jobi se cum oculis suis foedus pepigisse asserentis, ne eos ad virginem adverteret, Job. 31, 1.

journey that I am going to undertake, and will give me bread to eat and clothes to wear, so that I shall return safely to my father's house; and so if Jehovah will be my God, then this heap of stones that I set up will be as a statue to the Lord God, and of whatever you will give me I shall in all give a tenth to you." And such was Hannah's vow in 1 Samuel 1:11: "Lord God of hosts, if you will at all regard the affliction of your maidservant, and will remember me and not forget your maidservant, but if you will give a male offspring to your handmaiden, then I shall give him to Jehovah all the days of his life, and no razor shall come near his head."

18 And vows are divided also into perpetual and temporal. Pious people bind themselves to fulfill the thing* that was vowed throughout their whole life by means of the former, whereas they do so for some time of their life by means of the latter. Of the first there is an example in David (thesis 16), and of the latter in Paul (Acts 18:18).

19 And like the prayers that are often joined to them, so too the vows themselves are sometimes only conceived in the mind as it reaches out for God, as is seen in the case of Hannah (1 Samuel 1:11); and at other times they are also uttered by mouth, as is seen in the case of the Israelite people (Joshua 24:24).

20 And again, these vows are either public or private.

21 Public vows are solemnly performed either in a civic meeting (like Jephthah's vow in Judges 11:31) or in a meeting of the Church (like David's vow in Psalm 34 and 101).

22 Private vows are made in a place apart, a place removed from others, like Jacob's vow (Genesis 28:20).

23 Foremost among the causes* that compel the making of vows to God is God's command in Psalm 76:11: "Make your vows and render your vows to Jehovah your God, and let all who dwell round about Him bring a gift to Him who is to be feared." Second: the example set by the saints (Genesis 28:20; 1 Samuel 1:11). Third: the remembrance of benefits received from God, which caused David to say: "What shall I render to Jehovah? All his benefits overwhelm me. I shall soon repay my vows to Jehovah in the presence of his people."[6] Fourth: the hope of obtaining some new and special benefit that has been asked of God in prayer and that one expects will be obtained. It was on the basis of this hope that Jacob made a special vow to God (Genesis 28), as did Hannah, too, the mother of Samuel (1 Samuel 1). Finally: the serious purpose of the heart to check the lusts of the flesh against any depravity. Such was the vow of Job who stated that he made a covenant with his eyes that he would not look at a young woman (Job 31:1).

6 Psalm 116:12 and 14.

XXIV Tribus porro circumstantiis piorum vota in S. Scriptura limitantur, quarum prima est de illorum subjecto,* secunda de materia, tertia de objecto.

XXV Subjectum* votorum capax est homo cum quo Deus foedus gratiae* suae iniit.

XXVI Foedus illud gratiae quod Deus cum parentibus fidelibus pepigit, ad ipsorum quoque infantes pertinet, ideoque hi tamquam rami in illis, tamquam in radice sanctificati, ab illis communi* obedientiae voto implicite obligantur. Cujus implicitae obligationis sacramentum* olim fuit Circumcisio, nunc autem est Baptismus.

XXVII Ad cujus obligationis sanctionem, alterum Paschatis sacramentum* sub Vetere, ac sacrae Coenae sub Novo Testamento a Deo fuit institutum, ut non minus infantes rationis* usum per aetatem assecuti, quam ipsorum parentes, priorem obedientiae suae promissionem sollemni illius iteratione confirmarent.

XXVIII Quod votum generale, tam junioribus, quam senioribus a Deo, praescriptum, a quibusdam specialibus discerni debet. Illud utique ratum permanere debet, nec quicquam illi per humanam auctoritatem derogari potest.* Haec sunt irrita, si ab iis suscipiuntur, qui non sunt sui juris, sed vel patria, vel maritali, aliave auctoritate legitima constringuntur, Num. 30.

XXIX Hoc igitur primum Bellarmini axioma, *In qualibet hominum aetate, modo adsit usus liberi arbitrii, talia licere vota nuncupare, continentiae* scilicet, *obedientiae et paupertatis*, falsum est, cum haec vota nec sint generalia, nec a Deo praescripta, sed specialia et ab hominibus excogitata, ut suo loco demonstrabimus.* Vide Bellarm. lib. 2. *De Monachis*, c. 35.[a]

XXX Alterum Bellarmini axioma, *Filiis licere, invitis parentibus, ad Religionem* transire*, verum est, si de religione Christiana proprie* dicta intelligatur; at falsum, si ad statum aliquem singularem vitae religiosae aequivoce* sumptae ac reipsa superstitiosae (prout fit a Bellarmino) accommodetur, Bellarm. Lib. 2.

[a] Bellarmine, *De Monachis* 35 (*Opera* 2:603b).

Moreover, Holy Scripture defines the vows of the pious by three circum- 24
stances; the first of these concerns their subject,* the second their content-matter, and the third their object.

The subject* that is capable of making vows is the human being with whom 25
God has entered into a covenant of his grace.*

That covenant of grace which God has established with believing parents 26
applies also to their infant children; and accordingly, since these children, like branches of them, have been sanctified at the root, they are implicitly obligated by them in a joint* vow of obedience. In former times the sacrament* of this implicit obligation was circumcision, but now it is baptism.[7]

In order to confirm this obligation God instituted a second sacrament,* 27
namely, Passover in the Old Testament and holy supper in the New Testament, so that the children who over time have attained the use of reason,* no less than their parents should affirm the first promise of their obedience by solemnly repeating it.

We should make a distinction between this general vow, which God has pre- 28
scribed for younger as well as older people, and certain specific vows. That general one ought to remain completely valid, nor can* human authority detract anything from it. These special vows are void if the people who make them are not legally independent but are restricted by the authority of father, husband or some other lawful authority (Numbers 30).[8]

And therefore this first axiom of Bellarmine's, that "it is permitted to make 29
such vows (i.e., vows of chastity, obedience and poverty) at any point in a man's lifetime provided that he make use of his own free choice" is false, since these vows are neither general nor prescribed by God, but special vows and devised by men, as we shall point out* in its place.[9] See Bellarmine, the second book [of the Controversies regarding the Members of the Church], *On Monks*, chapter 35.

Bellarmine's second axiom, that "children are permitted, contrary to their 30
parents' will, to enter religious* life," is correct if the expression 'religious life' is understood to mean the Christian religion in the strict sense.* But it is false if the expression is applied to a special condition of life that is 'religious' taken in an equivocal* sense and that is actually superstitious (as Bellarmine makes it;

---

7 *SPT* 20.31 mentions Baptism and the Lord's Supper as ordinary vows that can be made by individual believers or—in the case of infant baptism—by their parents on their behalf. It is remarkable that the disputations on the sacraments do not repeat this connection with the vows.

8 See also *SPT* 20.61, note 14.

9 On the three monastic vows see *SPT* 20.4, note 2, 20.27 and 23.30, note 20.

De Monachis, c. 36.[a] Hac etenim ratione sub praetextu Religionis, liberis violatio quinti praecepti de parentibus honorandis, impie conceditur.

XXXI Quamvis autem vota specialia, quatenus sunt Legis ceremonialis appendices, per Christum sint abrogata, nullaque propterea de iis praeceptio exstet in Novo Testamento, quatenus tamen juris sunt naturalis* ac vincula quibus omnes homines ad opera moralia Deo naturaliter et per se debita arctius astringuntur, non minus ea nobis, quam Patribus nostris ante legem de iis latam, licita esse affirmamus.

XXXII Ad legem illam ceremonialem nondum Apostolorum temporibus penitus abrogatam, referendum est votum Paulinum, cujus mentio fit Actor. 18, 18.

XXXIII Quod attinet externa quorundam Christianorum exercitia voluntaria, cujus modi sunt abstinentia a potu et cibo consueto, aut ab aliis rebus in quarum usu aliquod ipsis periculum occasionis ad peccandum esse videtur, certae atque ordinariae precationes, certaeque Eleemosynarum largitiones, illa et similia non inutiliter ab ipsis suscipiuntur, modo omnis ab illis absit superstitio, illaque ad veram fidem, poenitentiam, sobrietatem, caritatem, aliasque virtutes Christianas alendas ex serio pii Deoque devoti animi proposito peragantur.

XXXIV Votorum materia aut res* sunt verbo Dei expresse praeceptae, aut non expresse praeceptae, sed arbitrariae. Illae per se sunt sanctae ac necessariae, hae per se quidem sunt ἀδιάφοραι, seu indifferentes, sed per accidens* fiunt sanctae atque utiles ad salutem quatenus ad cultum Dei principalem referuntur, ejusque promotioni inserviunt.

[a] Bellarmine, *De Monachis* 36 (*Opera* 2:605a).

Bellarmine, *On Monks*, chapter 36).[10] For in this way, under the pretext of "religion" children are wrongly granted a violation of the fifth commandment about honoring one's parents.

And although the special vows, insofar as they are appendices of the ceremo- 31
nial law, have been abolished in Christ, and for this reason there is no precept in the New Testament about them, yet insofar as they belong to natural* right and are chains whereby all people are more tightly bound to moral works that by nature and in themselves are owed to God, we state that they are no less permitted to us than to our forefathers before the law about them was given.

We should refer Paul's vow (mentioned in Acts 18:18) to that ceremonial law, 32
which had not yet been abolished entirely at the time of the apostolic age.[11]

As far as the outward, voluntary practices of some Christians are concerned, 33
ones of the sort that involve abstinence from customary drink and food or from other things which they think put them at risk of an occasion to sin, certain or ordinary prayers, and certain endowments of alms: It is not useless for them to undertake these and similar vows, provided that they are free of all superstition, and that it is from a serious purpose of a pious mind devoted to God that they complete these vows in order to foster true faith, repentance, sobriety, love, and other Christian virtues.

The content-matter of vows are either things* explicitly commanded by the 34
Word of God or things not explicitly commanded but arbitrary. The former are holy and necessary in themselves, while the latter are 'adiaphora' (or indifferent) in themselves but become holy by their circumstances* and useful for salvation insofar as they are related to the principal worship of God and serve its advancement.[12]

---

10 In the Roman Catholic tradition the expression 'religious life' refers to the life under a monastic rule. 'Entering religious life' means to join a religious order or congregation by taking the three vows. Here, Bellarmine refers to canonical rules stating that one must have reached at least the age of puberty (14 for boys, 12 for girls), when living in a monastery, and to the decision by the Council of Trent to set the minimum age for the (first) profession of vows at 16 for both sexes.

11 See *SPT* 18.46–47 on the ceremonial law and its abolishment. *SPT* 35.25 states that some aspects of the ceremonial law could be observed until the Gospel was sufficiently spread among the Jews, after which these laws were not only dead but also became deadly. See *SPT* 21.50 for the similar case of the temporary observance of the Sabbath.

12 For the distinction between works commanded by Scripture, which are absolutely good and necessary, and works not commanded by Scripture, which are indifferent, see *SPT* 34.14. There also the monastic vows are mentioned as belonging to latter. In *SPT* 35.32–33, it is explained that works that are indifferent by themselves, becomes good or bad "from the circumstances of their use."

XXXV Generale Christianitatis votum in Baptismo inchoatum, atque in Coena Domini renovatum, est tantum de rebus in Decalogo et Evangelio praeceptis.

XXXVI Specialia sunt, aut de rebus Decalogo et Evangelio non absolute* praeceptis, ut sunt caelibatus, et abstinentia a certo potu, cibo, vestimento, aliisque bonis usui hominum concessis; aut de rebus* partim praeceptis in genere, quoad earum substantiam,* partim non praeceptis in specie,* quoad temporum, locorum, personarum et occasionum circumstantias, ut sunt statae preces, jejunia, Eleemosynae, et similia pietatis officia, quorum publica determinatio judicio Ecclesiae, privata executio, cujusque fidelis arbitrio* a Deo permittitur.

XXXVII Priora vota de rebus* mere adiaphoris eminuerunt olim in Nazaraeis, Num. 6. ac laudata fuerunt in Rechabitis, Jer. 35. Posteriora in reliquis Judaeis; at nunc utraque damnantur, si quis ex opinione necessitatis,* libertati per Christum nobis partae omnino repugnantis, se aut alios, servili eorum jugo implicet. Gal. 5, 1. Coloss. 2, 20.

XXXVIII Pontificii vota Judaicis similia, aut sibi, aut aliis imponentes, votorum legitimorum conditiones, quarum nonnullas ipsimet approbant, nequaquam observant.

XXXIX Harum conditionum prima est, *Ut fiant juxta Dei praecepta*. At nullum in universa Scriptura de tribus votis, ad quae Monachi Romanenses astringuntur, praeceptum apparet. Et quamvis Bellarminus singula vota ex quibusdam Scripturae locis in sensum alienum a se detortis probare* satagat, nullum tamen producit, quo illa conjunctim affirmet.

XL Secunda est, *Ne quod verbo Dei praescribitur, aut permittitur, voto aliquo impediatur*. Sed hoc fit voto paupertatis, obedientiae et caelibatus.

XLI Nam voto paupertatis, aut potius mendicitatis, Monachi a labore quem Deus cuilibet homini praecipit, Gen. 3, 19. Exod. 20, 9. ad otia, quae dant vitia, abducuntur.

The general vow of Christianity that begins at Baptism and is renewed in the Lord's Supper extends only as far as things that have been commanded in the Decalogue and the Gospel. 35

Special vows are the ones that concern things that have not been absolutely* commanded in the Decalogue or the Gospel—such as celibacy, and abstaining from certain drink, food, clothing and other good things that have been given for man's use. Or they concern matters* that have been commanded partly in general (as far as their substance* is concerned) and partly not in specific* (as far as the circumstances of time, place, people, and events are concerned). Vows of this sort are the set prayers, fasting, almsgiving, and similar duties of piety, and the public determination of them God grants to the church's judgment, while the private execution of them is granted to each believer's choice.* 36

The former kind of vows about merely indifferent matters* stood out in former times in the case of the Nazarites (Numbers 6) and were praised in the case of the Rechabites (Jeremiah 35). The latter kind of vows is seen in other Jews; but nowadays both kinds are condemned if anyone binds himself or others with their enslaving yoke out of a notion of necessity* that completely conflicts with the freedom that Christ has obtained for us (Galatians 5:1; Colossians 2:20). 37

The pontifical teachers, in foisting Jewish-like vows on themselves or other people, take no account at all of the conditions of lawful vows while they themselves do approve of some of these stipulations.[13] 38

The foremost of these conditions is that vows be made according to God's commands. But in the whole of Scripture there is no text about the three vows to which the Romanist monks are bound. And despite making efforts to prove* individual vows from certain places of Scripture by twisting them into a meaning they don't have, Bellarmine produces not a single text with which to combine and so confirm them.[14] 39

The second condition is that no vow should pose a hindrance to what God in his Word prescribes or permits. But this is what happens in vows of poverty, obedience, and celibacy. 40

For with their vow of poverty, or rather of mendicancy, monks are drawn away from the work that God commands everyone (Genesis 3:19; Exodus 20:9) and drawn towards idleness which leads to vice. 41

13 Polyander probably refers to Bellarmine, who lists five categories that are excluded from the material content of vows: 1) sinful, 2) indifferent, 3) impossible, 4) necessary works and 5) good works that prevent a greater good; see Bellarmine, *On Monks* 14 (*Opera* 2:542b). Polyander's list of eight conditions includes Bellarmine's.

14 Bellarmine discusses biblical texts in support of each of the three vows in *On Monks*, 20–24 (*Opera* 2:552a–567b).

XLII Deinde voto obedientiae regularis, vel potius irregularis, iidem, posthabito voto obedientiae universalis soli Christo debitae, juxta Patris mandatum, *Hunc audite*, Matt. 17, 5. particularibus ac diversis hujus vel illius Praelati regulis humanis, tamquam divinitus ordinatis, simpliciter et sine ulla sententiae ac judicii sui contrarii exceptione auscultant.

XLIII Tertio denique voto perpetui caelibatus, Monachi injuste excluduntur a generali Apostoli praecepto, 1 Cor. 7, 2. *Propter scortationes suam quisque uxorem habeto*, cum ipsis quoque (confitente Bellarmino) insit periculum fornicandi, donumque continentiae, quam voverunt, possint amittere, et vinci aliquando a tentatione, Bellarm. lib. 2. *De Monachis, cap. 9*.[a]

XLIV Tertia conditio est, *Ne vota actiones sint suo genere malae*, quales sunt in Papatu sanctorum invocatio, imaginum ac reliquiarum veneratio, Monachorum otiosa mendicitas, et similes.

XLV Quarta est, *Ne majus bonum impediant*. Quod facit votum paupertatis, quo divites bonis suis renunciantes omni destituuntur facultate* Sanctorum communionem alendi per opera hospitalitatis ac beneficentiae, quibus Deus maxime delectatur, Hebr. 13, 16.

XLVI Quinta est, *Ne res* vota obsit officio quo quilibet ex jure naturali* ac morali in proximum fungi tenetur*. Talis est societatis humanae, atque imprimis propinquorum suorum desertio, quam Monachi voventes, ne consanguineorum suorum necessitati inservire cogantur, fidem Christianam quam ore profitentur, reipsa abnegant. Ubi enim est tanta inhumanitas, ibi nulla est in Deum pietas.

XLVII Sexta est, *Ne res* sit plerisque voventibus impossibilis*, ut est perpetua in vita caelibe castitas, cujus in monasteriis violationem totus Christianismus non sine gravi offendiculo ab aliquot retro seculis animadvertit.

XLVIII Septima, *Ne res sint ineptae, ludicrae et inutiles*, ut sunt peregrinationes religiosae, variae habituum Monachalium formae, abstinentia a certis ciborum generibus, etc.

---

[a] Bellarmine, *De Monachis* 9 (*Opera* 2:528a).

And what is more, with their vow of regular (or rather, irregular)[15] obedience, 42
those same monks put aside the vow of universal obedience that we owe to Christ alone, as the Father commanded: "Listen to him" (Matthew 17:5). And instead they naively, and without any restriction to their own contrary opinion or judgment, pay heed to the particular and various human rules of this or that Prelate as though they are divinely ordained.

And lastly, with their third vow, the one about perpetual celibacy, monks 43
are unfairly excluded from the apostle's general command: "Because of sexual immorality let every man have his own wife" (1 Corinthians 7:2). For even monks (as Bellarmine admits) are in danger of committing fornication, and they could lose the gift of chastity that they have vowed to keep, and at some time or other be overcome by temptation (Bellarmine, book 2, *On Monks*, chapter 9).[16]

And the third condition is that the vows should not consist in actions that are 44
evil in and of themselves—like the papacy's calling upon saints, the veneration of images and relics, the monks' idle mendicancy, and similar actions.

And the fourth condition is that vows should not cause a hindrance to a 45
greater good. And this is what the vow of poverty does, whereby the wealthy renounce* their own goods and deprive themselves of any ability to provide for the communion of saints through deeds of hospitality and kindness, wherein God takes great delight (Hebrews 13:16).

The fifth condition is that whatever* is vowed should not stand in the way of 46
the duty which everyone is bound to perform for his neighbor out of natural* and moral law. Such is the abandonment of human community, and especially of one's neighbors, which monks vow to do: that they will not be forced to serve the needs of their own relatives, and so they actually deny the Christian faith which they profess with their mouth. For where there is such inhumanity, there can be no piety towards God.

The sixth condition is that to most of those making the vow the matter* 47
ought not to be impossible; a matter of this sort is the perpetual chastity of a celibate life. It is with no small scandal that all of Christianity has been observing the violation of this vow in monasteries since several ages ago.

The seventh condition is that there be no foolish, comical, and useless things, 48
like religious pilgrimages, the various kinds of monks' clothing, abstinence from certain types of food, etc.

---

15 Polyander plays upon the word 'regular,' which in Roman Catholic usage means 'according to a monastic rule (*regula*).'

16 Bellarmine, *De Monachis* 9 (*Opera* 2:528a). In this very same passage, Bellarmine notes that Luther himself makes an exception for those who do have the gift of chastity. It seems that Bellarmine refers to a text by Luther on 1 Corinthians 7, *WA* 12:99.

XLIX Octava, *ut ab iis absit omnis opinio cultus necessarii ac meritorii apud Deum ex opere supererogationis*. In qua opinione Bellarminus Monachos suos hac voti definitione confirmat: *Votum est religiosa promissio alicujus excellentioris boni Deo facta*.[a] Quae Bellarmini definitio, hac falsa nititur hypothesi, quod bonum aliquod excellentius in Evangelio nobis a Christo commendetur, quam a Deo in Lege mandetur. Cujus falsitatem in superioribus nostris Disputationibus de Lege et Evangelio abunde demonstravimus.*

L Idem est votorum objectum adaequatum, quod est precum, nempe Deus, ad quem solum veri adoratores vota sua direxerunt, juxta praeceptionem ipsius, Deut. 23. Psal. 50. et 76.

LI Quapropter Pontificios qui sua quoque vota Sanctis mortuis ac Coenobiarchis nuncupant, pro sacrilegis idololatris honorem soli suo Creatori debitum creaturis ejus attribuentibus jure merito habemus.

LII Forma votorum interna in eo consistit, ut praevia mentis deliberatione libere fiant, atque ex certa fidei cognitione ac fiducia, sine qua Deo placere nequeunt; externa, ut etiam lingua exprimantur, quae, licet Dei καρδιογνώστου respectu non sit necessaria, ad nostri tamen zeli sanctique propositi vota nostra Deo cum proximi quoque aedificatione offerendi testificationem, non inutiliter adhibetur.

LIII Finis* votorum summus ac generalis est Dei gloria subordinati ac speciales sunt:

1. Ut erga Deum, tum nostram resipiscentiam ob peccata adversus ipsum commissa, tum nostram εὐχαριστίαν seu gratitudinem ob beneficia ab ipso accepta testemur.
2. Ut hoc calcari ad cetera omnia pietatis, caritatis, justitiae et misericordiae officia, quae a nobis proficisci possunt, magis excitemur.

---

[a] Bellarmine, *De Monachis* 14 (*Opera* 2:542a).

The eighth condition is that vows should be entirely free of any notion of worship that is necessary, or meritorious in the eyes of God on the basis of work that is supererogatory.[17] Bellarmine confirms his fellow-monks in this notion by means of the following definition of vow: "A vow is a religious promise made to God about some more excellent good."[18] This definition of Bellarmine rests upon this false assumption: that in the Gospel Christ recommends to us some good that is more excellent than what God commands in his Law. We have abundantly demonstrated* the untruth in this definition in our earlier disputations about the Law and the Gospel.[19] 49

The proper object of vows is the same as for prayers, namely, God, to whom alone true worshipers have directed their vows, in accordance with his command (Deuteronomy 23; Psalm 50 and 76). 50

And therefore we have every good reason to consider the papal teachers as sacrilegious idolaters for making also their vows to the deceased saints or to the heads of monasteries, for they ascribe the honor that is due only to their Creator to the creatures He has made. 51

The internal form of vows consists in the fact that, following prior considerations of the soul, vows are freely made and arise from a certain knowledge and confidence of the faith, without which they cannot be pleasing God. Their outward form is that they are expressed also in speech, and even though this is not necessary for God since He knows the hearts, yet the outward form is put to good use as a witness of our zeal and holy intent to offer vows to God, while also edifying our neighbor. 52

The highest and general goal* of making vows is the glory of God; subordinate and particular goals include: 1) That we bear witness to God of our repentance for sins committed against him, as well as our gratitude (*eucharistia*) for the benefits that we have received from Him. 2) That by means of this goad we are very much spurred to all the other duties of piety, love, righteousness, and mercy, that can proceed from us. 53

17 On supererogatory works see *SPT* 34.31.

18 For the vows as related to the evangelical counsels see *SPT* 33.9, note 28.

19 See *SPT* 18.38–39, 22.35–52, 23.20.

DISPUTATIO XXXIX

De Purgatorio et Indulgentiis[a]

Praeside D. ANDREA RIVETO
Respondente GUILIELMO SOESTIO

THESIS I Postquam in praecedentibus disputationibus actum est de Officiis Christi, ejusdem Satisfactione pro peccatis nostris, satisfactionis applicatione per veram fidem in hominis justificatione, et eorum qui ejus participes fuerunt, gratitudine in sanctificatione et sanctificationis operibus; deque vero Jejuniorum, Eleemosynarum, et Votorum usu, quibus abutuntur Pontificii ad stabiliendas extra Christum satisfactiones humanas; merito subnectemus de Purgatorio et Indulgentiis disputationem elencticam, qua ostendemus, ascititia haec hominum inventa, nullo solido fundamento* inniti, sed Christi meritis et satisfactioni unicae detrahere, et Ecclesiae Dei injuria esse; cujus partem unam, eamque non infimam, apud inferos ad tempus cruciari fingunt.

II Ne autem adversariis aliquid de nostro affingamus, ex eorum scriptis primum exponemus controversiae statum, et quae apud eos certa et de fide habentur, a minus certis et de quibus disputatur, distinguentes; adversus illa praesertim rationes* nostras dirigemus. Sic enim ipsi monent, *quaedam esse dogmata de purgatorio magis aut minus certa, quae a suis tenentur, quae non*

[a] The original disputation was published as Andreas Rivetus, *Disputationum theologicarum trigesima-nona, de purgatorio et indulgentiis*, resp. Guilielmus Soestius (Leiden: Isaac Elzevir, 1623) and was dated May 3, 1623.

DISPUTATION 39

On Purgatory and Indulgences

President: Andreas Rivetus
Respondent: Guilielmus Soestius[1]

In the preceding disputations we treated the offices of Christ, his satisfaction 1
for our sins and the application of that satisfaction in the justification of man by true faith. We also treated the gratitude in sanctification and the works of sanctification by those who were made partakers of that justification, and the correct use of fasting, almsgiving, and vows, which the papal teachers misuse in order to establish a satisfaction by man apart from Christ. Having done that, it is right for us to append an elenctic disputation[2] about purgatory and indulgences in which we shall demonstrate that these made-up human inventions are not based on any solid foundation* but take away from the merits and unique satisfaction of Christ and are harmful to the church of God—a part of which church (and that not the smallest part) they imagine undergoes temporary torment in the underworld.[3]

To avoid attributing to our opponents anything of our own making, it is 2
from their writings that first we shall present the state of the controversy, and distinguishing what they themselves consider certain and necessary to believe[4] from the things that are less certain and debated, we shall direct our arguments* especially at those former things. For they themselves give this warning: "Some teachings which we hold about purgatory are more or

1 Born in 1599 in Utrecht, Wilhelmus Soestius, or Guilielmus Soustius, matriculated in philosophy on November 30, 1618 at the age of 21. He defended this disputation in 1623. He was ordained in Schalkwijk in 1626, Zaandam in 1629, Rhenen in 1637 and Rotterdam in 1638; he became emeritus 1676, and died in 1679. See Du Rieu, *Album studiosorum*, 138 and Van Lieburg, *Repertorium*, 233.

2 This disputation explicitly is called elenctic because it is the first in the *SPT* on a topic that is exclusively polemical, serving to refute the Roman Catholic position. Many of the references and expressions are similar to those of Johann Gerhard's discussion of purgatory, first published in 1621 in his *Loci theologici*. See Gerhard, *Loci* 8:132–226.

3 For the translation of *inferi* as 'underworld' see note 9 below.

4 The expression *de fide*, literally 'on faith,' refers to the highest level of doctrinal truth in Roman Catholicism. These infallible and revealed truths can be distinguished from the catholic truths like the existence of God, which can be known through reason alone, and from several types of theological opinions.

perinde quibuslibet testimoniis et argumentis simul confirmantur, sed aliis atque aliis*. Greg. de Val. in 3. part. Thom. *Disp*. 11. qu. 1. punct. 1. §. 4.[a]

III Sed primam et praecipuam notionem nominis* hanc esse statuunt, secundum quam purgatorium esse aeque probari* putant testimoniis* quae afferri solent vel ex Scriptura, vel ex Patribus, vel ex definitionibus Ecclesiasticis; qua intelligunt Locum aliquem, quo post mortem, eorum fidelium animae, quae vel obstrictae adhuc reatu alicujus temporalis poenae, vel etiam aliquibus peccatis *venialibus*, ex corpore migraverunt, secundum justitiae divinae rationem cruciantur; quoad penitus ab hujusmodi peccatis expiatae, beatitudinem coelestem consequi valeant. Greg. de Valent. ibid.[b] Bellarm. lib. 1. *De Purg*. c. 1.[c]

IV Omissis igitur controversiis apud ipsos Pontificios agitatis, de *Loco purgatorii*, de quo etsi fateantur Ecclesiam suam nihil definivisse, secundum tamen magis receptam sententiam, quam veriorem esse censent, subterraneum esse putant, et vicinum inferno damnatorum; *de igne*, quem plerique proprium, etsi alii improprium; *de ejusdem qualitate,** nempe an verus sit et corporeus, quam

[a] Gregory of Valencia, *Commentarii theologici* 4:2188. [b] Gregory of Valencia, *Commentarii theologici* 4:2188. [c] Bellarmine, *De Purgatorio* 1.1 (*Opera* 3:53).

less certain, teachings that are not equally confirmed by all testimonies* and arguments whatsoever at once, but by differing ones" (Gregory of Valencia, [*Theological commentary on*] *Thomas Aquinas's* [Summa theologiae], part 3, disputation 11, question 1, point 1, paragraph 4).[5]

But they posit the following as the first and foremost meaning of the word,* 3
according to which they think that it is rightly proved* that there is a purgatory by the testimonies* which they are accustomed to adduce either from Scripture or the church fathers or the ecclesiastical definitions.[6] And by [purgatory] they mean some place whereto those believers' souls migrate from the body upon death, being bound still by the liability of some temporal punishment or even by some venial sins,[7] and experience torments relative to the reckoning of God's justice, until such time as they have completely expiated such sins and are able to obtain the blessedness of heaven (Gregory of Valencia, ibid., Bellarmine, *On Purgatory*, book 1, chapter 1).

And therefore we leave aside the controversies that the papal teachers have 4
stirred up amongst themselves about the location of purgatory, whereof they admit even that their own church has made no definitive decision[8]—although by the more accepted opinion (which they deem to be more true) they think that it is below the earth and next to the hell[9] of the condemned. [And we leave aside the controversy] about the fire, which the majority think is fire in the proper sense (though others: improper); about the quality* of that fire, namely

5 The definition of purgatory is literally the same as the one given by Gregory of Valencia.

6 I.e., in the official canons of church councils.

7 For the distinction between the two effects of sin: the liability of guilt and the liability of punishment see *SPT* 16.20–28. Roman Catholics believe that the liability of guilt can be forgiven in this life only by God's mercy and grace, usually through the sacrament of penance. This forgiveness also implies the remission of the eternal punishment for having turned away from God. However, they claim that it does not necessarily imply the remission of the temporal, satisfactory punishments for having turned to temporal, created goods as one's final end. The liability of this punishment remains and must be carried either in this life or in the afterlife.

8 The Council of Trent declared that the more difficult and subtle questions regarding purgatory, and things uncertain should not be discussed in publications for an uneducated audience (DH 1820).

9 The term *infernum* can have a meaning more general than 'hell' and refer to the lower regions where the spirits of the deceased dwell. In the twelfth century the idea arose that the underworld consists of four divisions: the hell of the damned (*infernum* in the strict sense), the Limbo of the fathers, the Limbo of the infants, and purgatory. In this disputation *infernum* is only translated as 'hell' when the meaning is restricted to the place of eternal damnation, otherwise the more general 'world below' is chosen; see thesis 5 below; *inferi* is translated as 'underworld' in thesis 1 above.

certissimam esse suorum Theologorum sententiam asserunt; *de suffragiis vivorum pro defunctis* et similibus; *substantialem* illam, quam vocant, et primariam vocabuli notionem considerabimus, et ad regulam veritatis exigemus: quandoquidem dogma illud suum, tam creditu necessarium esse statuunt, ut qui illud negat, *illum in gehennae sempiterno incendio* cruciandum judicet Bellarminus, l. 2. *De Purg*. cap. 15.[a] Et Panigarula non dubitavit negare Deum esse, *si purgatorium non sit*. *Lect. de Purg*. Taurini habita.[b]

V Nos vero, et Deum esse firmissime credimus, et tale purgatorium esse constanter negamus, nec inferni poenas eo nomine extimescimus; qui praeter Christi sanguinem et Spiritus Sancti gratiam, quae verbo et Sacramentis* in hac vita credentibus dispensantur, scimus nullum purgatorium esse a Deo institutum, nisi forte quis dicat afflictiones et castigationes a peccatis purgare; quod tamen non faciunt vi propria sed occasionaliter tantum, ut sic dicam, quatenus παθήματα sunt μαθήματα, quibus de infirmitatibus nostris monemur, ut ad medicum recurramus, quae ratio afflictionibus ignis purgatorii post hanc vitam, ipsis fatentibus adversariis, competere non potest.

VI Falsissimum est quod supponunt, Ecclesiam Catholicam perpetuo sensisse tale purgatorium esse, quam suppositionem existimant sufficere debere, ad retinendam purgatorii assertionem, *licet nullum haberent Scripturae testimonium,* aut argumentum aliud*. Quod fundamentum* caute substernunt, conscii sibi, quicquid ex Sacra Scriptura proferunt, obtorto collo trahi ad alienam causam; nec posse* fidem facere iis quibus non est objectum ob oculos Pontificiae

[a] Bellarmine, *De Purgatorio* 1.1 (*Opera* 3:53). [b] Francesco Panigarola, *Disceptationes Calvinicae* (Milan: Pacifico Da Ponte, 1594), 288–289.

if it is real and corporeal (which they affirm is their theologians' most solid opinion); about the support that the living give for the sake of those who are deceased (and similar things). What we shall examine is what they call that 'substantial' and primary meaning of the word ['purgatory'], and we shall test it by the rule of truth, since they hold that it is so necessary to believe that teaching, that Bellarmine judges that he who denies it must suffer torment in the eternal fire of hell (*On Purgatory*, chapter 15). And [Francesco] Panigarola[10] did not hesitate to say that there is no God if there is no purgatory (*Lecture on Purgatory*, held at Turin).

But as for us, we believe very firmly in the existence of God and we also 5
steadfastly deny that this sort of purgatory exists—nor do we, for that reason, fear the punishments of the world below. For we know that God has instituted no purgation except the blood of Christ and the grace of the Holy Spirit, which is distributed to believers by the Word and sacraments* in this life—unless, perhaps, someone should state that afflictions and chastisements purge away sins. They, however, don't do this by their own power, but only as occasions, that is insofar as 'sufferings are lessons' (to say it in this way)[11] whereby we are warned through our weaknesses to take recourse in a doctor—a logic that cannot apply to the afflictions of the purgatorial fires after this life (as our opponents themselves admit).

Their assumption, that the catholic Church has always been of the opinion 6
that such a purgatory exists, is completely false; and they consider that this assumption should be sufficient to preserve the claim of purgatory—although they have no testimony* from Scripture or any other argument.[12] And they carefully lay down this basis,* for they are themselves aware that whatever they produce from Holy Scripture is dragged 'by the scruff of the neck'[13] to support a matter foreign to it, and is not capable* of making those people believe whose

10 Francesco Panigarola (1548–1594), bishop of Asti, was a renowned Italian preacher. According to Roman Catholic sources, he was responsible for the conversion of many Calvinists in France and Savoy. Panigarola also wrote many books and commentaries, and published collections of sermons in Latin and Italian.

11 The Greek play upon words, *pathēmata mathēmata* not only occurs in Hebrews 5:8, which says that Christ learned (*emathen*) from the things he suffered (*epathen*), but also is common in other Greek writings. Herodotus, *History* 1.207 and Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 177. The expression became proverbial.

12 The Council of Trent stated that the church had taught the existence of purgatory from Scripture and from the ancient tradition of the fathers (DH 1820). On the relation between Scripture and the unwritten traditions see *SPT* 2.6 and 4.3–6 and the footnotes there.

13 The Latin expression *obtorto collo* comes from the realm of Roman law, according to which a plaintiff was permitted to drag a reluctant defendant to court.

auctoritatis glaucoma, et traditionum humanarum nubecula, quae Catholicae Ecclesiae auctoritatem falso sibi vendicat.

VII Quamvis ergo nonnulla Scripturae testimonia* torqueant, fuerunt tamen in ipso Pontificiorum regno, quibus veritas extorsit, *non esse in promptu adducere unam aliquam Scripturam, qua protervientem adigat, uti velit nolit, confiteatur*, purgatorium esse, *et si aliqua esse possit, tamen diligentissimos inquisitores hactenus latuisse*, Roffensis contra Lutherum articul. 18.[a] Hinc est quod in Gallia, Petrus Cottonus Jesuita, cum superos flectere non posset, Acheronta movere conatus est, et quod hactenus diligentissimos latuerat, ope daemonis eruere, cui inter alias quaestiones hanc proposuit: *Quis esset in Scriptura locus ex quo Purgatorium posset evidenter probari?**[b]

VIII Scilicet noverat, quod ingenue praefatur Petrus a Soto, in Sacerdotum instructione, lect. 1. de Purg.[c] *minus apertas, minus efficaces esse, et minus probare* auctoritates Scripturae quae a suis Doctoribus afferuntur; illis itaque non esse utendum ad probandum* Purgatorium*. Item, *Non esse necessarium nec*

[a] John Fisher, *Assertionis Lutheranae confutatio* ([Cologne]: [Peter Quentel], 1523), 620. [b] Cf. Jacques Auguste de Thou, *Historiarum sui temporis*, 5 vols. (Geneva: Petrus de la Rouière, 1620), 5:1136B, lib. 132.13. [c] Petrus de Soto, *Tractatus de institutione sacerdotum* (Dillingen: Sebald Mayer, 1560), 219v.

eyes have not been glazed over by the 'cataracts' of pontifical authority and the 'corneal blemish'[14] of human traditions that wrongly claims for itself the authority of the catholic Church.

And so even though they twist some testimonies* of Scripture, there still 7
were some within the realm of the papists itself who were compelled by the truth to say that "one cannot readily produce any one Scripture-passage with which to compel an impudent person, whether he is willing or not, to confess that purgatory exists, even if there could be such a passage—although until now it has escaped the notice of the most careful investigators" (Bishop of Rochester, *Against Luther*, article 18).[15] And hence it happened that in France the Jesuit Pierre Coton, when he was not able to persuade the living, tried to move Acheron,[16] and he did dig up what until then had escaped the notice of the most careful observers—assisted as he was by a demon, to whom he put the following question (among others): "What place is there in Scripture from which one could clearly prove* purgatory?"[17]

For obviously he knew what Peter de Soto[18] states frankly in his *Lectures on* 8
the Institution of Priesthood (On Purgatory, lecture 1), "that the authoritative passages of Scripture adduced by our teachers are less clear and less effective, and demonstrate* less, and that therefore people should not use them to prove*

14 The words *glaucoma* (opacity, glaze) and *nubecula* (a little cloud) are medical terms for ocular cataracts and spotting of the cornea.

15 John Fisher (1469–1535) was bishop of Rochester and chancellor of the University of Cambridge. He refused to accept Henry VIII as head of the Church of England and was executed. His *Confutation of Martin Luther's Assertion* (1523) contained a detailed theological defense of Luther's excommunication by the pope.

16 In Greek myth, the Acheron—a river in southern Epirus—was one of the rivers of the underworld. In Hellenistic and Latin poetry the name indicated the underworld itself.

17 Rivetus refers here to a story that first appears to have been recorded by the French historian Jacques-Auguste de Thou in his massive and controversial *Historia sui temporis* (1604–1620). According to this story, Pierre Coton (1564–1626) visited a demon-possessed girl named Adrienne de Fresne in Paris in 1604, and asked her a number of questions that troubled him, including what the best Scriptural support for the doctrine of purgatory was. Coton's visit inadvertently became public when he omitted to remove his list of questions from the book of exorcisms he had borrowed for the visit, in spite of King Henry IV's attempts to quash the embarrassing affair involving the respected Jesuit scholar. See Jacques-Auguste de Thou, *Histoire universelle de Jacques-Auguste de Thou, depuis 1543 jusqu'en 1607*, 16 vols. ('London' [Paris]: n.p., 1734), 14:326–329 (book 132).

18 The Spanish Dominican Pedro de Soto (1493–1563) and confessor to Charles V taught theology at the universities of Dillingen and Oxford and participated in the Council of Trent (1559). He is not to be confused with the better known Dominican Domingo de Soto (1495–1560).

opportunum inniti auctoritati loci ex Matt. producti cap. 12.[a] *Non remittetur neque in hoc seculo, neque in futuro, quia responderi potest, dictum esse secundum quandam exaggerationem et hyperbolem*. Neque celebri illa auctoritate 1Cor. 3. *Sic tamen quasi per ignem*, obtineri, esse aliquod tale purgatorium post mortem, *quia talis ignis debet intelligi, ut ambo per eum transeant, tam qui aurum, quam qui foenum aedificant: Quae ratio,** inquit idem, *efficacissime arguit, ibi non probari purgatorium post mortem, aut si cui videtur nihilominus probari posse, certe propter ambiguitatem, sensus minus est evidens. Quare nec illi innitendum*.

IX Locus autem ex cap. 12. Lib. 2. Machab. quem in prima acie collocant Bellarminus[b] et Greg. de Valent.[c] de igne aliquo purgatorio, aut loco in quo animae ustulantur, nihil habet, et ita potest explicari. ut ex eo suffragia pro mortuis, saltem ex facto Judae, probari* non possint. Sed praeterea *de libri illius auctoritate, an scilicet canonicus sit, dubium fuit apud antiquos, quod tempore Augustini nondum satis explicatum videbatur*, ait idem Soto, qui asserit, *dogma de purgatorio certius et evidentius* esse, quam sit libri illius auctoritas: nec esse evidentiora minus evidentibus confirmanda*.[d]

X Non solum esse dogma ἄγραφον sed etiam ἀντίγραφον, ut ostendamus, non opus est (quod inique ex adversariis nonnulli postulant) ut negativam illam αὐτολεξεὶ et totidem verbis* ex Scriptura asseramus, *non est locus purgatorius animarum post mortem*. Sufficit si ostendamus, multis modis dogma illud

[a] Petrus de Soto, *Tractatus de institutione sacerdotum*, 220r–v. [b] Bellarmine, *De Purgatorio* 1.3 (*Opera* 3:55). [c] Gregory of Valencia, *Commentarii theologici* 4:2191. [d] Petrus de Soto, *Tractatus de institutione sacerdotum*, 221r.

that purgatory exists." And likewise, "that it is neither necessary nor opportune to rely on the authority of the passage taken from Matthew chapter 12[:32], that 'there will be no forgiveness either in this age or in the one that is to come,' because one could reply that this is said through some exaggeration and hyperbole." Nor does it hold on the basis of that well-known passage in 1 Corinthians 3[:13]—"and so as through fire"—that upon death there is some sort of purgatory, "because we should understand this sort of fire to mean that both those who build with gold and those who build with straw pass through it." And the same author says that "this reasoning* very effectively argues that this passage does not prove a purgatory after death, or if it seems to someone that it can be proven nonetheless, then certainly on account of its ambiguity the meaning is less clear. And therefore one should also not rely on that passage."

But the passage from 2 Maccabees 12, which Bellarmine and Gregory of 9
Valencia place in the vanguard, contains nothing about any purgatorial fire or place where souls are burned, and it can be so explained that it is impossible on the basis of it (at least, from the deed of Judas) to prove* assistance for the deceased.[19] Yet what is more, "among the ancients there existed doubt about the authority of that book (whether or not it belongs to the canon), and in Augustine's time this appeared not yet sufficiently resolved," as the same de Soto says, and he asserts, "the doctrine of purgatory is more certain and evident* than the authority of that book; and one should not prove what is more evident by means of what is less evident."

In order for us to demonstrate that this doctrine is not just an 'unwritten' one 10
but even 'contrary to what is written'[20] there is no need for us (although some of our opponents unfairly demand it) to make the case for the negative argument, word-for-word* and literally from Scripture: "There is no purgatorial place for souls after death."[21] It is sufficient if we show in many ways how that dogma of

19 The chapter describes how the Maccabees after the battle against Gorgias buried their fallen men and found tokens of idols under their tunics. Judas prayed for them that their sin might be blotted out and provided for a sin offering in Jerusalem, thus making atonement for the dead to deliver them from their sin. It is quite understandable that this passage was cited as evidence for purgatory as well as for prayers and sacrifices for the dead; for the connection between them see thesis 32 below. Gregory of Valencia notes the protestant objection that the books of the Maccabees were not canonical (*Theological commentary* 4, disputation 11, question 1.1, *Commentarii theologici*, 4:2191).

20 The background is the usual distinction between written and unwritten word or between Scripture and tradition; see thesis 6, note 12 above. Calling the doctrine of purgatory *antigraphos* is word play.

21 Rivetus might be thinking of the Colloquium at Durlach (1613) which was to be held between Francis Duke of Lorraine with three Jesuits scholars and George-Frederick Mar-

Pontificiorum, cum Scriptura et recta ratione* pugnare. 1. Scriptura inter fideles et infideles, bonos et malos, intrantes per angustam et per latam portam, filios seculi et filios Diaboli, spirituales et carnales, etc. nullum medium ponit sed inter tales ubique immediatam oppositionem constituit, Luc. 16, 8. Matt. 7, 13. Matt. 25, 32. Joh. 5, 29. Rom. 8, 5. etc. Ergo non agnovit medios illos, *neque valde malos, neque valde bonos*, quibus sublatis, vacuum est purgatorium.

XI Eadem Scriptura duas tantum vitas commendavit, et Augustino teste, Tractatu 124. in Joh.[a] *Easdem sibi divinitus praedicatas et commendatas novit Ecclesia, quarum una est in fide, altera in specie; una in tempore peregrinationis, altera in aeternitate mansionis; una in labore, altera in requie; una in via, altera in patria; una in opere actionis, altera in mercede contemplationis, etc.* Primam autem hujus vitae terminis definit ac diserte circumscribit Paulus Rom. 8, 18. 2 Cor. 5, 10. Idem perspicue docet, *ea quae videntur, temporalia esse, quae autem non videntur, esse aeterna*, 2 Cor. 4, 18. Cum autem status animarum post hanc vitam sit invisibilis, eundem aeternum esse oportet. Ipsi Scholastici* per viatores intelligunt tantum, qui adhuc istius lucis usura fruuntur.

XII Scimus, cum eodem Apostolo, 2 Cor. 5, 1. *Si terrestris domus nostra hujus habitationis dissolvatur, quod aedificationem ex Deo habemus, domum non manufactam, aeternam in coelis*, non temporalem in inferis. *Extra duos hosce ordines*, inquit Ephraem Tom. 1. *Tract. de mans. beatis*,[b] *alius non est ordo medius;*

[a] Augustine, *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus CXXIV 124.5* (CCSL 36:685). [b] Ephraem the Syrian, *Opera omnia quae extant Graece, Syriace, Latine*, 6 vols. (Rome: Salvioni, 1732–1746), 3:25–26.

quis of Baden with his evangelical pastors. The colloquium never really got off the ground since the Jesuits, led by Jean Gontéry (1562–1616), demanded against all rules of disputation that the evangelicals prove *negative* propositions by using the very words of Scripture without any further reasoning, deductions, etc. The proceedings were translated from German into Latin; see Jacob Gretser (trans.), *Brevis relatio de colloquio* (Ingolstadt: Angermarius, 1613). Cf. Willem J. van Asselt and others, *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2011), 234–235, note 28. For the use of *autolexei* (in express words) for the Jesuit position see Gerhard, *Loci* 8:133.

the papal teachers conflicts with Scripture and sound reasoning.* 1)[22] Scripture does not put anything in the middle between believers and unbelievers, good and bad, between those who enter by the narrow gate and those who enter by the wide one, the sons of eternity and the sons of the devil, the spiritual and the carnal, etc.; but everywhere it has established a direct opposition between these sorts of people (Luke 16:8; Matthew 7:13; Matthew 25:32; John 5:29; Romans 8:5, etc.). And therefore it does not acknowledge that there are people in the middle, who are "neither altogether evil nor altogether good;" and when these are taken away, then purgatory is empty.

The same Scripture points out that there are only two lives, and Augustine 11
also testifies "that the Church knows that God has proclaimed and pointed out to it the same two lives, of which one is in faith and the other in sight. The one is in the time of sojourn, the other in its eternal abode; the one is struggling while the other is at rest; the one is *en route* while the other has reached the fatherland; the one is actively working while the other has been rewarded with beholding, etc." (Treatise 124, on John). Paul clearly delimits and circumscribes the first of these lives within the boundaries of this current life (Romans 8:18; 2 Corinthians 5:10). And he evidently teaches that "what is seen is temporary, and what is not seen is eternal" (2 Corinthians 4:18). But since the state of souls after this life is unseen, it must be eternal. The Scholastics* themselves understand by *viatores* ['sojourners'] only those people who are still enjoying the use of that light.[23]

And, with the same apostle, we know that "if the earthly tent we live in is 12
destroyed, we have a dwelling-place from God, a home not made with hands, eternal in the heavens," and not a temporal one in the realm below. And Ephraem [the Syrian][24] states: "Beyond these two orders there is no other, mid-

22 There is a list of arguments from Scripture and reason against purgatory in theses 10–27. Only the first argument is numbered and sometimes an argument just seems to flow into the next. From thesis 28 onward the disputation returns to countering more specific Roman Catholic positions on purgatory.

23 On the characterization of all human knowledge of God in this world as pilgrim theology (*theologia viatorum*) see *PRRD* 1:225–238, and Willem J. van Asselt, "The Fundamental Meaning of Theology: Archetypal and Ectypal Theology in Seventeenth-Century Reformed Thought," *Westminster Theological Journal* 64 (2002), 319–335. For the phrasing cf. Gerhard, *Loci* 8:138.

24 Ephraem the Assyrian or the Syrian (c. 306–373) wrote hymns, sermons in verse, as well as prose and works of biblical exegesis, among others on Genesis and Exodus, all in the Syriac language. He was ordained a deacon in Nisibis and after its conquest by the Persians he moved to Edessa. The reference is to one of his sermons that was included in the

loquor autem de altero quidem superno, altero vero inferno. Et paulo post, *Effugere gehennam, hoc ipsum est regnum coelorum ingredi, quemadmodum et ex eo excedere, est gehennam introire. Neque enim nos tresregiones Scriptura edocuit*. Certe, nam *qui credit, transit de morte ad vitam*, Joh. 5, 24. Et a *modo requiescunt a laboribus suis, qui in Domino moriuntur*, Apoc. 14, 13. Nam absurdum est quod Bellarminus et alii statuunt, nonnullos *partim in Domino partim non in Domino mori*;[a] quasi dicerent, aliquem ad metam pervenisse, qui tamen extra metam adhuc vagaretur.

XIII Ubicunque Scriptura praecepta et exempla εὐθανασίας proponit, nullam non tantum cruciatuum et tormentorum formidinem piis incutit; sed spei et gaudii plenissimam materiam eorum animis ingerit, quod fieri non posset,* si piis in Christum credentibus, post mortem metuendae essent purgatorii flammae, ab inferni igne sola duratione differentes, Esa. 57, 1. *Justus perit et non est qui recogitet in corde suo, et viri misericordiae colliguntur, etc. veniet pax, requiescet in cubili suo, qui ambulat in dilectione*. Ideo morientes *dimitti se petebant in pace*, Luc. 2, 29. quia iis *qui ad mortem usque fideles sunt*, promittitur *corona vitae*, non praeparatur[b] supplicium ignis, Apoc. 2, 10. Quam eandem tam omnibus *Christi adventum diligentibus*, quam sibi reservatam post hujus vitae certamen testatur Apostolus, 2 Tim. 4, 8.

XIV Si quis aliqua purgatione satisfactoria post mortem indiguisset, certe is latro qui conversus fuit in cruce, qui se confitebatur *digna factis* recipere, Luc. 23, 41. debuisset purgatorias poenas post mortem multis annorum centenis luere, qui tamen audit a Christo, *Hodie mecum eris in Paradiso*. Nam quod Pontificii nonnulli asserunt, mortem patientissimo animo toleratam et confessionem

[a] Bellarmine, *De Purgatorio* 1.12 (*Opera* 3:88b). [b] intentatur: original disputation.

Latin edition of Ephraem's works, edited by Gerardus Vossius Borghlonius (c. 1547–1609) *Operum omnium Sancti Ephraem Syri*, 3 vols. (Rome: Tornerius, 1589–1593), 1:32.

dle order; yet I do speak about one order above and another below" (Treatise *Regarding the Mansions of the Blessed*). And a little farther on, "Fleeing Gehenna precisely means to enter into the kingdom of heaven, just as to depart from heaven is to enter Gehenna. For Scripture also has not taught us that there are three regions." Correct, for "he who believes has crossed over from death to life" (John 5:24). And "from now on they rest from their labor who die in the Lord" (Revelation 14:13). For what Bellarmine and others state is wrong, "that some die partly in the Lord and partly not in the Lord"[25]—as if to say that someone who is still wandering beyond it has reached the turning-point.

And whenever Scripture presents teachings and examples of dying well,[26] 13
it does not strike any fear of torments and physical pain into the hearts of the pious; rather, it instills the fullest measure of hope and joy—which could* not possibly happen if pious believers in Christ had to fear the flames of purgatory after their death, flames that are different from the fires of hell only in the length of time: "The righteous perishes and there is no-one who takes it to heart, and men of compassion are gathered away, etc. Peace will come, and he who walks in love will rest upon his bed." (Isaiah 57:1) And accordingly those who were going to die "sought to be dismissed in peace" (Luke 2:29) because those who were faithful unto death are promised the crown of life (Revelation 2:10), but the punishment of the fire is not being prepared for them. And the apostle testifies that the crown that has been reserved for him after the struggle of this life is the same as the one reserved for everyone who cherishes Christ's coming (2 Timothy 4:8).

If there was anyone who needed some satisfactorial purging upon death 14
then surely it was the murderer who was converted upon the cross, who confessed that he was receiving what his deeds deserved (Luke 23:41). He ought to have suffered the purgatorial punishments for many hundreds of years after his death, and yet he heard Christ say: "Today you will be with me in Paradise." For the fact that some papal teachers assert that death undergone by this soul

25 Gerhard also calls Bellarmine's statement "wrong" (*absurdus*) but does not refer to others who hold the same position (*Loci theologici* 8:143). Bellarmine's position was, for instance, defended by the German convert to Roman Catholicism Caspar Schoppe (1576–1649) in his response to the Lutheran theologian Aegidius Hunnius (1550–1603). See Caspar Schoppe, *Apologeticus adversus Aegidium Hunium pro gemino de indulgentiis libro* (Munich: Henricus, 1601), 75.

26 On the use of the term *euthanasia* for the art of dying well see Jan Hoek, "'Euthanasia' in the seventeenth century: *Ars Moriendi* in Dutch Reformed Perspective," in *Strangers and Pilgrims on the Earth: Essays in Honour of Abraham van de Beek*, ed. Paul van Geest and Eduardus van der Borght (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 329–341. For the phrasing cf. Gerhard, *Loci* 8:139–140.

admirandam, potuisse in justam satisfactionem reputari, Bellarm. *De Purgat*. Lib. 1. c. 2.[a] (unde sunt inter Jesuitas qui hunc latronem *Christi Martyrem* appellant) omnino repugnat Scripturae et rectae rationi;* *nam qui patitur quasi homicida, aut fur, aut maleficus*. 1 Pet. 4, 15. ille certe non patitur pro Christo.

XV Nec est quod quis dicat, *privilegia paucorum regulam non facere*. Nam idem promissum omnibus fidelibus factum est, *quod non venient in judicium sed transierunt a morte ad vitam*, Joh. 5, 24. *Super quos non cadet sol, nec aestus*;[b] ergo non ignis purgatorius, Apoc. 7, 16. Ideo anima Lazari, simul ac e corpore egressa fuit, ab Angelis in sinum Abrahae delata est, ubi consolatione fruebatur, Luc. 16, 22. Ergo non sensit ὠδῖνας gravissimas in purgatorio. In hac fide morientes, *cupiebant magis emigrare e corpore et praesentes esse apud Dominum*, 2 Cor. 5, 8. *dissolvi et esse cum Christo*, Phil. 1, 23. Nempe qui sciebant, *velle* Dominum, *ut quos dedit ipsi Pater, ubi ille est, sint* etiam *cum illo, et videant gloriam ipsius*; non autem in inferno juxta damnatos similem ignem in multos annos patiantur.

XVI Tempus vitae praesentis esse tempus sementis, post hanc vero vitam esse tempus messis, Scriptura testatur, Gal. 6, 7. quo *referet quisque prout gessit in corpore suo*, 2 Cor. 5, 10. Esse nunc *tempus acceptabile, dies salutis*, 2 Cor. 6, 2. Filium hominis dimittere peccata *in terra*, Matt. 9, 6. Et quae dimittuntur aut solvuntur in terra, eadem in coelo dimitti et solvi, Matt. 16, 19. Cum ergo remissio peccatorum et salus, in hac tantum vita, per fidem ministerio verbi et Sacramentorum* accensam obtineatur, vel amittatur, et in coelo exspectandus sit effectus eorum quae in terra geruntur, frustra purgatorium extra terram habitabilem et coelum statuitur.

XVII Ipsa doctrina de Purgatorio cum remissione peccatorum consistere non potest.* Dicunt Jesuitae, *in altera vita non esse locum nisi justitiae, in retribuendo videlicet poenam vel praemium, pro meritis aut demeritis hujus vitae*. Greg. de

[a] Bellarmine, *De Purgatorio* 1.12 (Opera 3:88a). [b] nec ullus aestus: original disputation.

suffering death with a most patient mind and his admirable confession could have counted as just satisfaction (Bellarmine, *On Purgatory*, book 1, chapter 2)—this is why among the Jesuits there are some who call this murderer "martyr for Christ"[27]—completely contradicts Scripture and sound reasoning.* "For whoever suffers as a murderer, or thief, or evildoer" (1 Peter 4:15) certainly is not suffering for the sake of Christ.

Nor is it valid if someone were to say: "The privilege of a few does not 15
make for a rule." For all believers receive the same promise, "that they will not enter into the judgment but have gone over from death to life" (John 5:24). "And the sun will not beat down upon them, nor will scorching heat," hence, no purgatorial fires (Revelation 7:16). And accordingly as soon as the soul of Lazarus departed from his body, the angels carried it to the bosom of Abraham, where he enjoyed consolation (Luke 16:22). And therefore he did not suffer the grievous pains of purgatory. Those who die in this faith "desired rather to be away from the body and to be present with the Lord" (2 Corinthians 5:8), "to depart and to be with Christ" (Philippians 1:23). Indeed, they knew that the Lord "willed that those whom the Father had given to him would be where he is, even with him, and that they might behold his glory"[28]—and therefore not that they should be in the world below alongside the damned, suffering a similar fire for many years.

Scripture testifies that the time of this current life is the time for sowing, but 16
that after this life is the time for harvesting (Galatians 6:7) "when everyone will receive according to what he has done in the body" (2 Corinthians 5:10); that now "is the acceptable day of salvation" (2 Corinthians 6:2); that the Son of man forgives sins "on earth" (Matthew 9:6). And, what is forgiven or loosed on earth, the same is forgiven and loosed in heaven (Matthew 16:19). Therefore, since the forgiveness of sins and salvation is obtained (or lost) only in this life through faith that is kindled by the ministry of the Word and Sacraments,* and since the effect of the things that are done on earth is to be looked for in heaven, the making of a purgatory outside the inhabited world and heaven makes no sense.

The very doctrine of purgatory cannot* co-exist with the remission of sins. 17
The Jesuits state that "in the next life there is no place except that of righteousness,[29] namely, in the retribution of punishment or reward, in return for what has been merited or demerited in this life" (Gregory of Valencia, disputation 11,

27 Gerhard (*Loci* 8:141) refers to Jesuits at a colloquy in Regensburg (1601).

28 John 17:24.

29 The meaning of this statement is that forgiveness of guilt belongs to God's mercy. It can only be given during this life. Retribution of punishment belongs to God's justice. This can also have a place in the afterlife.

Val. *Disp*. 11. quaest. 1. punct. 1.[a] Ergo nullus est secundum eos locus misericordiae. Remissionem vero peccatorum esse misericordiae effectum, si quis neget ad agnatos et gentiles est ablegandus. Nam quod addit Jesuita, remitti peccata eatenus *quatenus per solutionem poenae satisfit divinae justitiae*, adeo est absurdum ut etiam blasphemam consequentiam pariat, Christo nempe remissa fuisse peccata, qui divinae justitiae plene satisfecit.

XVIII Nec minus absurdum est quod dicunt, remissa culpa purgari hominem a peccato, dum ab eo post hanc vitam temporalis exigitur poena. Cum ipse Bellarmin. *De Purgat*. lib. 2. cap. 4.[b] *Poenam* debitam, seu reatum poenae, *maculam non gignere, sed debitorem facere*, fateatur: ubi autem nulla est macula, quid opus est purgatione? Deinde, quod purgatur, illud aufertur, nam aufert Deus maculas quas purgat; at in purgatorio infertur poena usque ad ultimum quadrantem, ex hypothesi adversariorum. Quis unquam audivit aliquem purgari a poena, quam integram pati cogitur? Nam si quis dicat, eos qui sunt in purgatorio aliquando levari poenis per vivorum suffragia, etsi hoc falsum sit; inde tamen sequitur tantum, suffragia et satisfactiones vivorum esse purgatorias, non ignem aliquem esse purgatorium, qui non purgat, sed a quo purgantur et liberantur, pro quibus satisfactum est, quo sensu passivo, poenae damnandis debitae erunt purgatoriae, quia Christus suos ab illis, satisfaciendo liberavit.

XIX Ex his concidit praecipuum adversariorum fundamentum,* quo necessario fatendum esse contendunt, tempus aliquod et locum post mortem superesse, quod animae extra ipsum coelum et etiam extra infernum damnatorum, a reatu poenae et culpa veniali expientur, ut ingredi possint in regnum coe-

[a] Gregory of Valencia, *Commentarii theologici* 4:2204. [b] No such argument is made in *De Purgatorio* 2.4 (*Opera* 3:105–108). It could refer to the discussion in Bellarmine, *De indulgentiis* 2.3 (*Opera* 7:62b–63a).

question 1, point 1). According to them, therefore, there is no place for mercy. But if someone says that the forgiveness of sins is not an effect of mercy, then he should be 'placed in the care of his relations and kinsmen.'[30] For what the Jesuit adds, that sins are forgiven "only insofar as the payment of the penalty makes satisfaction for God's justice," is so foolish that it brings forth the blasphemous consequence that even Christ, who fully satisfied God's justice, had his sins forgiven him.[31]

And no less absurd is their statement that with the remission of guilt a man is 18
cleansed from sin, while after this life a temporal punishment is exacted from him. For Bellarmine himself admits that "the penalty which is owed" (or the liability of the penalty) "does not produce a stain but makes one a debtor" (*On Purgatory*, book 2, chapter 4).[32] But where there is no stain what need is there for purging? And also, whatever is cleansed is taken away, for God takes away the stains which he purges. But, according to our opponents' assumption, in purgatory punishment is exacted unto the very last penny. Who has ever heard of someone who is purged from a punishment which he is forced to suffer in its entirety? For if someone says that those who are in purgatory sometimes are relieved from punishments through the assistance of the living (even though this is not true) then it follows from that only that the help and deeds of satisfaction by the living are purgatorial, but not some fire which does not actually purge but from which those people for whom satisfaction is made are purged and set free, in which passive sense even the penalties the damned deserved would be purgatorial, because Christ has liberated those who belong to Him from these penalties by making satisfaction.

As a result of all this the most important basis* of our opponents' contention 19
collapses, upon which they argued that one must necessarily confess that after death there remains some time and place when, outside heaven itself and even outside the hell of the damned, souls make atonement for their liability of punishment and their venial guilt in order to be able to enter into the

30 The Latin expression *agnatos et gentiles ablegare* ('to place in the care of relations and kinsmen') derives from Roman law, which appointed caretakers for those who were insane. See, for example, Cicero *On Invention* 2.50.148 and *Tusculan Disputations* 3.4.5.

31 To confirm purgatory, Gregory of Valencia refers to Matthew 12:32 about the forgiveness of sins in the age to come. Over against the objection of Martin Chemnitz (1522–1586) that remission of sins does not necessarily imply purgatory, he states that remission implies satisfaction of divine justice. To those to whom sins are forgiven they are forgiven only insofar as satisfaction is made. Rivetus argues that if you interpret remission of sins as satisfaction to divine justice, the consequence would be that because satisfaction implies that one has sinned, Christ would have sinned.

32 For the liability of guilt and the liability of punishment or of the penalty see note 7 above.

lorum, quia tales reperiuntur, qui cum sint in gratia* Dei, in regnum tamen coelorum statim absque alia expiatione non admittantur, cum nihil illuc intret, ulla ratione *coinquinatum*, nec sit ibi Ecclesia jam habens aliquam *maculam et rugam*. Negamus, aliquam maculam aut rugam remanere in iis qui in gratia moriuntur, ad quos pertinet dictum Apost. Rom. 6, 7. *Qui mortuus est, justificatus est a peccato*. Poenam praeterea debitam, maculam non inurere, fassus est Bellarminus. Idem fatetur, *in morte tolli fomitem peccati, sublata sensualitate*. Lib. 2. *De Purgat*. cap. 9.[a] Ubi non est peccati fomes, ibi nullum potest* esse peccatum, ne veniale quidem. Sublata enim causa* tollitur effectus.

XX Adde quod distinctio peccati venialis a mortali apud Pontificios usurpata, definitioni peccati repugnat, quod non tantum est *extra Legem*, sed etiam *contra Legem*, ac proinde maledictionis divinae reum facit, cui non est remissum. Cum autem qui moriuntur in gratia, non sint sub maledictione, neque etiam rei sunt alicujus peccati; quod nullum sua natura* adeo est minutum, sive ex *levitate materiae*, sive ex *imperfectione operis*, ut maledictionem aeternam non mereatur, cum omnis transgressio legis sit morte digna, Deut. 27, 26. Divina autem lege interdici peccata etiam minutissima, Christus docuit, Matt. 5, 22. Nec excipitur aliquod peccatum, pro quo sanguis Christi non fuerit effusus, cum purget nos ab omni peccato, 1Joh. 1, 7. cujus macula si in aliquo remaneat a Christo ante obitum non deleta, is poenae aeternitate sentiet, se non in loco aliquo purgatorio esse, sed in gehenna. Nam *stipendium peccati mors*, Rom. 6, 23.

XXI Nec solidius est fundamentum* aliud quod purgatorio et indulgentiis (de quibus infra dicendum erit) substernitur; nempe post remissionem culpae mortalis et poenae aeternae, aliquam poenam temporalem exstare exsolven-

[a] Bellarmine, *De Purgatorio* 2.9 (Opera 3:117a).

kingdom of heaven. For [they argue] the sort of people are found who, although they are in the grace* of God, nevertheless are not granted immediate entry into the kingdom of heaven without making some additional expiation, since nothing gains entry there that is defiled in any way, and also since there is no church there that still has some "stain and wrinkle."[33] But we state that there is not any stain or wrinkle that remains in those who die in grace, and the apostle's statement applies: "Whoever has died has been made righteous from sin" (Romans 6:7). And moreover, Bellarmine has admitted that the penalty that is owed does not brand a stain. He also admits that "in death the tinder for sin is taken away when all sense perception is removed" (*On Purgatory*, book 2, chapter 9). And where there is no tinder for sin, there no sin at all can* exist, not even venial sins.[34] For if the cause* is taken away then its effect is removed.

And add to this the fact that the distinction which the papal teachers make 20
between venial and mortal sins goes against the definition of sin, for sin is not just "outside the Law" but even "contrary to the Law" and so it makes one liable to God's curse, for which there is no forgiveness. But since those who die in grace are not under the curse, and are not liable to any sin, because no sin is by its own nature* so minor (whether that be 'due to the lightness of its subject-matter' or 'due to the incompleteness of its working')[35] that it does not deserve an everlasting curse, since all transgression of the law is worthy of death (Deuteronomy 27:26). But Christ has taught that even the smallest sin is proscribed by God's law (Matthew 5:22). And there is no exception for any sin for which Christ did not pour out his blood, since it purges us from all sin (1John 1:7). If the stain of sin is not wiped away by Christ in anyone before he dies, then he will forever experience the punishment of being not in some place that purges, but in hell. For "the wages of sin is death" (Romans 6:23).

Nor is the other basis* that they place in support of purgatory and indul- 21
gences (whereof we must speak below)[36] any more solid, namely that following the forgiveness of mortal guilt and eternal punishment there is some tempo-

33 Ephesians 5:27.

34 The tinder for sin (*fomes peccati*) is a term in hamartiologia denoting an inordinate quality in man, which accompanies original sin. It is not an actual sin nor original sin itself but an abiding characteristic of man in this life. Grace can mitigate it but not eradicate it. See Oberman, *Harvest of Medieval Theology*, 469. On concupiscence and the tinder for sin see also *SPT* 15.25 and 36.

35 The Reformed rejected the distinction between mortal and venial sins. On the one hand, every sin, even the one that seems most trifling, is in itself a deadly sin. On the other hand, every sin of a person who lives under divine grace is pardoned sin, because such a person can never fall away completely from grace or faith. See Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 349.

36 See thesis 37–54 below.

dam, vel in hac vita operibus poenalibus satisfactoriis, vel post hanc, in aliquo igne purgatorio.[a] Haec enim supponunt aliquas esse satisfactiones pro peccato praeter satisfactionem Christi, quod dogma absurdum et blasphemum esse, satis ostendunt consequentiae quas inde nectunt, *nempe Christi meritum tum perfectae satisfactionis nomen* non mereri*, quae verba sunt Tapperi Lovan. Theol. in expl. art. 6. Lov. Tom. 1.[b] contra expressas Scripturae Sacrae sententias, quae testantur, conjectas fuisse in eum iniquitates omnium nostrorum, eumque nos ab omni iniquitate redemisse, etc. Esa. 53, 6. Tit. 2, 14. 1Joh. 1, 7. et infinitis* aliis in locis.

XXII Quibus testimoniis* convicti, etsi nonnulli fateantur, *Christum plenissime satisfecisse pro reatu culpae ac poenae temporalis et aeternae omnium peccatorum*, Bellarmin. lib. 2. *De Indulg*. cap. 10.[c] addunt tamen, quibus quod verbis* concedunt, reipsa auferunt; quia nullas satisfactiones Christi iis qui post Baptismum incidunt in peccata, volunt prodesse, nisi ipsi suis satisfactionibus peccata sua diluant; ac si satisfactio Christi ideo praestita esset, ut nos ipsi pro peccatis nostris satisfaceremus; qua ratione* absurde volunt, per satisfactiones nostras nobis satisfactionem Christi applicari; quem applicandi modum, extra fidem et Sacramenta,* ignorat Scriptura, et ab eo abhorret recta ratio. Quis enim unquam audivit, poenam poena, et Christi satisfactionem ustionibus et tormentis applicari? quomodo misericordia per executionem justitiae in nobis applicaretur, remissio debitorum per exactionem debiti, et venia punitione?

XXIII Perpetuam fallaciam ab ignoratione Elenchi committunt, cum multis argumentis ex Scriptura et experientia petitis probare* conantur, post culpam remissam pios variis modis a Deo affligi, etiam propter peccata admissa et remissa. Non enim id vertitur in dubium; sed in eo est τὸ κρινόμενον, an tales poenae temporales infligantur a Deo, ad satisfactionem pro peccatis nostris, vel ex toto, vel ex parte, non vero potius, ad *demonstrationem debitae miseriae, ad emendationem labilis vitae, ad exercitationem necessariae patientiae*.[d] Id nos

---

[a] For a very similar expression see Gregory of Valencia, *Commentarii theologici* 4:2207. [b] Ruard Tapper, *Opera omnia*, 2 vols. (Cologne: Birckmann, 1582), 1:152. [c] Bellarmine, *De indulgentiis* 2.10 (*Opera* 7:76b). [d] Augustine, *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus CXXIV 124.5* (CCSL 36:684).

ral penalty that must be discharged, either in this life by means of works that make satisfaction for penalties, or in the life hereafter, in some purgatorial fire. For these words assume that there are some satisfactions for sin besides the satisfaction of Christ, and the consequences that are associated with it show sufficiently that this teaching is foolish and blasphemous, i.e., "that Christ's merit does not then deserve to be called* perfect satisfaction" (these are the words of [Ruard] Tapper, theologian at Leuven, in the *Explication of Articles*, tome 1 article 6).[37] They are contrary to the explicit statements in Holy Scripture which testify that it was upon him [Christ] that the iniquities of us all were laid, and that He has redeemed us from all iniquity (Isaiah 53:6; Titus 2:14; 1John 1:7, and countless* other places).

And there are a few who are convinced by these testimonies,* who confess 22
"that Christ has made the fullest satisfaction for the liability of guilt of both temporal and eternal punishment of all sins" (Bellarmine, *On Indulgences*, book 2, chapter 10). And they nevertheless add things to it whereby they actually take away what they concede in their words.* For they want none of Christ's satisfactions to be of any help for those people who fall into sins after baptism, unless they themselves have washed away their own sins by means of their own satisfactions—as if Christ's satisfaction was presented for the purpose that we ourselves should make satisfaction for our sins. By means of this reasoning* they foolishly want Christ's satisfactions to be applied to us by means of our own satisfactions. But Scripture has no knowledge of this mode of application besides faith and the sacraments,* and sound reasoning finds it abhorrent. For who has ever heard that punishment is applied by punishment, and that Christ's satisfaction is applied by means of purifying fires and torments? In what way would mercy be applied through the execution of righteousness in us; how would the remission of debts be applied through the exaction of a debt, and pardon be applied by means of punishment?

They continue to advance their fallacies by ignoring the proofs of our refu- 23
tation, when they try by means of the many arguments sought from Scripture and human experience to prove* that after He has forgiven guilt, God afflicts the pious in various ways, also for sins that had been committed and forgiven. For this is not the point that is turned into doubt; but the crux of the matter is the question whether it is to make satisfaction for our sins that God inflicts such temporal punishment (whether the satisfaction is in whole or in part) rather than "to demonstrate the misery which we deserve, to correct our faulty lives, and to exercise the needed patience." This is what we contend, while we

37 Ruard Tapper argues that the satisfaction of Christ does not deserve the name of satisfaction merely by its sufficiency without its efficacy or application.

contendimus, aliud a Pontificiis assutum constanter negamus; et poenas temporales Davidi et aliis post peccatum inflictas, asserimus, pertinuisse tantum ad παιδείαν et δοκιμασίαν, non autem fuisse vel ex parte vel ex toto λύτρον pro peccatis, quia post remissionem, *sunt certamina exercitationesque justorum, quae ante remissionem sunt supplicia peccatorum*, ut loquitur Augustinus *De peccat. mer. et remiss*. lib. 2. cap. 34.[a]

XXIV Praeterea negamus, poenas illas castigatorias aut purgatorias, ultra hujus vitae terminos extendi, quod ex illarum fine,* propter quem infligi solent, perspicue probatur,* qui partim vitae nostrae emendatione, partim in exemplari aliorum cautione, et nostra ipsorum in futurum praecautione consistit, quae in mortuis locum ullum habere non possunt:*[b] *ad hoc enim corripit Deus ut emendet, ad hoc emendat, ut servet*, ut bene Cyprian. lib. 4. *Epistol*. 4.[c] qui etiam post *mortem nullum poenitentiae locum, nullum satisfactionis effectum agnoscit*, *ad Demetr. Tractat*. 1.[d] Ideo. *poenitentiae et remissionis peccatorum, in hac vita tantum praescriptum tempus nos habere*, suos catechumenos docebat Cyrillus Jerosol. *Catech*. 18.[e] Est enim haec vita tempus medicinae. *Cum autem poena consideratur ut medicina, tum aliquis pius interdum punitur sine sua culpa, quippe quae per Christum ipsi est condonata, non tamen sine causa*.* Ut recte distinxit Thomas 2, 2. *quaest*. 108. artic. 4.[f]

XXV Denique a poenis a Deo inflictis, ad poenas satisfactorias ab hominibus vel imponendas, vel ultro suscipiendas, nulla est consequentia, quas si Deus requireret ad satisfactiones, *bis vindicaret in id ipsum*, et duplicem satisfactionem contra justitiae regulam acciperet. Nam quod respondent, esse *subordinatas* nostras satisfactiones Christi satisfactionibus, id frustra dicunt; quia contraria subordinari non possunt.* Sunt autem contrariae, satisfactio perfecta et imperfecta, unica et multiplex, imo *imperfecta satisfactio*, non est satisfactio, cum sit

[a] Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* 2.34.54 (CSEL 60:123–124). [b] nec in mortuis locum ullum habere non potest:* original disputation. [c] Cyprian, *Ep*. 11.5.1 (CCSL 3B:61). [d] Cyprian, *Ad Demetrianum* 25 (CSEL 3A:370). [e] Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech*. 18.34–35 (MPG 33:1057–1059). [f] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 2/2.108.4.

steadfastly deny the former piece that is stitched onto it by the papal teachers.[38] And we make the assertion that the temporal punishments imposed on David and others after they had sinned have to do only with their instruction and testing, but were not (either in part or in whole) a ransom-price for sin, because after sin is forgiven "the things that are punishments for sin before remission, after remission has been granted become the contests and exercises of the righteous" (Augustine, *On the Merits and Remission of Sin*, book 2, chapter 34).

And moreover we assert that those punishments that chasten or cleanse 24
do not reach beyond the boundaries of this life, a fact that is clearly shown* from the goal* for which they are usually imposed, which is partly to improve our own lives, partly as exemplary warning for others and as a precaution for ourselves for the future also. It is impossible* for these things to have a place among the deceased: "For God chastises in order to correct, and he corrects in order to preserve us," as Cyprian well puts it (book 4, epistle 4). And Cyprian also "realizes that there is no place at all for repentance after death, and no effect from making satisfaction" (*To Demetrius*, treatise 1). And accordingly Cyril used to teach his catechumens that "it is in this life only that we have the time prescribed for repentance and forgiveness of sins" (Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechism* 18). For this current life is the time for healing. "But when punishment is viewed as a means of curing, then occasionally it happens that some pious person is punished without guilt on his part (since this guilt really is forgiven him through Christ) but not without a reason."*—a distinction correctly made by Thomas (*Summa theologiae* 2/2, question 108, article 4).[39]

And finally, from the punishments God inflicts there is not any consequence 25
at all for people's imposition or voluntary undertaking of satisfactorial punishments, for if God should demand them as satisfactions then He would punish twice for the same act, and contrary to the laws of justice He would receive double satisfaction. For it is to no end that they give as their response that our deeds of satisfaction are "subordinate" to Christ's satisfactions, for things that are opposite cannot* be subordinated to each other. And these are in fact opposites: perfect and imperfect satisfaction, a once-for-all and a manifold satisfaction. In fact, an "imperfect satisfaction" is no satisfaction at all, since the

38 Namely that the afflictions of the pious would also be for the satisfaction for their sins. Bellarmine states that the death of David's son in 2 Samuel 12 was a satisfaction for his sins and denies that it was only to admonish him for his sins or to exercise his patience (*On Indulgences*, book 2, chapter 13, *Opera* 7:83b–85a).

39 In discussing vengeance Aquinas states that God in his hidden judgment can punish a person in temporal matters "without any guilt on his part, but not without reason." Gerhard provides exactly the same paraphrase of Thomas (*Loci* 8:146–147).

contradictio in adjecto. Quod si satisfactionem acciperent, pro alicujus conditionis impletione requisita, ad participandam satisfactionem Christi, quae per Metaphoram satisfactio diceretur, id quidem tolerari posset, etsi a catachresi cavendum esset; sed cum illi *vere et proprie*,* pro peccatis nostris, Deo nos satisfacere asserant, non possunt ullo praetextu excusari. Christus qui *purgationem peccatorum nostrorum per seipsum fecit*, Ebr. 1, 3. nemini hunc honorem communicavit.

XXVI Quae autem loca citantur ex Scripturis, aut exempla afferuntur,[a] in quibus vel requiruntur fructus digni poenitentia, vel opera laboriosa suscepta fuerunt a piis, etc. Ea minus ad rem* pertinent, quia a viventibus tantum, non a mortuis[b] requisita fuerunt, aut facta; et nunquam de satisfactione proprie* dicta, sed de simplici conditionum in nobis requisitarum praestatione, vel etiam, ut dictum est, de paterna Dei castigatione, et non de judiciaria punitione, intelligi debent; quia nullum est κατάκριμα iis qui sunt in Christo, Rom. 8, 1. quibus cum remissa sit culpa, non potuit juste infligi poena, qua talis. Cum inter culpam et poenam propriam, tanta sit conjunctio, ut uno et eodem plerumque nomine,* utramque lingua sancta expresserit, Levit. 16, 9. et ubi *debitum* remissum est, tollatur omnis obligatio.

XXVII Necessitatem* illam satisfaciendi pro reatu poenae temporalis et culpis venialibus, ante beatitudinis possessionem, evertit plane conditio eorum, qui in novissimo die superstites, *in occursum Domini rapientur per aërem*, 1Thess. 4, 17. Nam ita transmutabuntur ἐν ἀτόμῳ, ἐν ῥιπῇ ὀφθαλμοῦ, ut nullis poenis purgatoriis locus et tempus imaginari possit. Cum ergo praedicatio Evangelii et vera

[a] sunt: 1642. [b] non autem a mortuis: original disputation.

added term contains a contradictory element. But if they take satisfaction to mean the required fulfillment of some condition or other in order to partake of Christ's satisfaction (which [fulfillment] through metaphor could be called 'satisfaction'), that could indeed be tolerated, although one would have to be wary of misapplying the term. But when they claim that we make satisfaction for our sins to God in the "true and proper sense,"* then they cannot be excused under any pretext whatsoever.[40] Christ, who "by himself has made purification for our sins" (Hebrews 1:3) did not share this duty with anyone else.

But the places cited from Scripture are either examples wherein fruits that befit repentance are required, or they are difficult deeds the pious have undertaken, etc. They are less relevant to the matter* at hand because these works had been demanded of or performed by living people only, and not by the deceased. These deeds should never be understood as being about satisfaction in the strict sense,* but about merely fulfilling conditions that are required in us;[41] or they are even about God's fatherly chastening, as has been said, and not about judicial punishment. For "there is not any condemnation for those who are in Christ" (Romans 8:1). Since their guilt has been forgiven it could not have been just to inflict any punishment as such. And since there is such a close connection between guilt and its proper punishment, the sacred language has expressed both of them mostly with one and the same word* (Leviticus 16:9);[42] and where the debt has been forgiven, there every obligation is taken away. 26

That need* to make satisfaction for the liability of temporal punishment and venial guilts before obtaining the blessed inheritance is clearly overturned by the state of those who are alive on that very last day, who will "be caught up to meet the Lord" (1 Thessalonians 4:17). For they will be changed in a split-second, in the twinkling of an eye, so that it is impossible to imagine a time and place for any purgatorial punishments. Therefore since the preaching of 27

40 Rivetus is probably summarizing the Roman Catholic position in his own words; it is difficult to find sources that subordinate human satisfaction to Christ's satisfactions or that explain human satisfaction as a condition to partake of Christ's satisfaction. For the claim that we make satisfaction for our sins to God in the "true and proper sense" see, for instance, the statement of Gregory of Valencia that indulgences are 'proper' because members of the church can make satisfaction for one another (*Theological commentary* 4, disputation 7, question 20.1, *Commentariorum theologicorum* 4:1884).

41 Against the background of the Arminian controversies and the Synod of Dort, Rivetus's admission of "some condition or other in order to partake of Christ's satisfaction" in thesis 25 above might seem somewhat striking. Rivetus, however, specifies that they are "required *in* us"—that is, not *by* us, as the Arminian position entails.

42 The Hebrew word *chatta'ath* is used both for sin and for the goat for the sin offering on Yom Kippur.

in Christum fides meritum Christi apprehendens, sit semper, et ejusdem virtutis, quae ratio* esse potest, cur qui superioribus seculis obierunt, et qui singulis diebus moriuntur, igne potius sint ustulandi et torquendi, quam ii quos vivos novissimus dies deprehendet? Nam quod excipiunt Pontificii, purgandos esse illos tum gravissima illa tribulatione, quae novissimum diem praecedet, tum igne de coelis descendente, quando obviam rapientur Domino, absurdissime dicitur. Primo quia tribulatio illa extrema omnibus hominibus erit communis,* proinde non natura* sua purgatoria, ad statum vitae praesentis pertinebit, de quo jam non agitur; Ignis praeterea de coelo descendens non erit purgatorius, sed εἰς ἐκδίκησιν impiorum atque incredulorum descendet, Apostolo teste, 2 Thess. 1, 8.

XXVIII Quae cum ita sint, merito purgatorium Pontificium, ad Gentium et Poetarum figmenta et fabulas, ex quibus originem sumpsit, relegamus. Non enim credimus, si tale quid a Platone in Gorgia et Phaedone, a Cicerone in Somnio Scipionis, et a Virgilio Aeneid. 6. aut a Claudiano poeta et similibus,[a] commendatum fuerit, aut a Mahumetanorum Alcorano, vel Thalmude superstitiosorum Judaeorum insinuatum; inde sequi, vel id eos didicisse ex populo Dei, vel ex naturae* lumine, et principiis* notis hausisse, nisi forte communem* hanc thesim, *purgatione peccatorum opus esse, priusquam aliquis beatitudine fruatur*. Sed quia hypothesim de vera purgatione peccatorum in Christo, et de ejusdem

[a] Plato, *Gorgias* 525a e.v. *Phaedo* 81c e.v. Cicero, *Somnium Scipionis*, Vergil, *Aeneid*, VI.268 e.v. Claudius Claudianus, *In Rufinum* 2, 466–527.

the Gospel (and the true faith that takes hold of Christ's merit) happens all the time and maintains the same force, what reason* can there be why those who have died in bygone ages as well as those who are dying daily should be burned and tortured by fire any more than those who will be taken on that very last day? What the papal teachers object is a very foolish thing to say, i.e., that those people must be purged by the very great tribulation that precedes the very last day as well as the fire that comes down from heaven when they will be taken to meet the Lord. Firstly, because all people will share* in that final tribulation, and so by its own very nature* it will not be purgatorial but will relate to the state of the current life (which we are not dealing with at this point). And secondly, the fire that comes down from heaven will not be purgatorial, but it will come down as a punishment for the impious and unbelieving, as the apostle testifies (2 Thessalonians 1:8).[43]

This being the case, we rightly relegate the purgatory of the papal teachers 28
to the figments and fables of pagans and poets, from whom it took its origin. For we do not believe that if any such thing was recommended by Plato (in his *Gorgias* and *Phaedo*) or Cicero (in his *Dream of Scipio*), and Virgil[44] (*Aeneid* 6) or Claudian the poet[45] and similar writers, or if it was hinted at by the Quran of the Mohammedans or the Talmud of superstitious Jews,[46] that it must therefore follow that those authors either had learned it from the people of God or by the light of nature* had deduced it from known principles*—unless there is some common* belief that "there is need of a purging from sins before anyone can enjoy blessedness." But because they have no knowledge whatsoever of the premise about the true purging from sins in Christ and its application by

43 The objection of the papal teachers and Rivetus's second counterargument are phrased in nearly the same terms as in Gerhard, *Loci* 8:154.

44 The Roman poet Vergil (70–19 BC) depicts Aeneas's journey to the underworld in *Aeneid* Book 6.

45 The Latin poet Claudian (c. 370–c. 404) has a few lines in his poem against Rufinus which were interpreted as a reference to purgatory.

46 Bellarmine mentions the same four ancient authors, 2 Maccabees 12 and Josephus as Jewish sources and the Quran in general as an Islamic source (*De Purgatorio* 1.11, Opera 3:85). Gerhard offers a more extensive discussion of the pagan, Islamic and Jewish origins of purgatory (*Loci* 8:164–165). For the Talmud he refers to Rosh HaShanah 16b–17a that distinguished three groups on the day of judgment: those who are completely righteous, those who are completely wicked, and those in between, who will be refined through the fire as silver and tested as gold. For the Mohammedans Gerhard refers to the so-called confession of Mohammed that all would go through purgatory; see *Concilium Tridentinum: Diariorum, actorum, epistularum, tractatuum nova collectio*, 13 vols (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1901–1976), 6/3:281, note 25.

applicatione ex doctrina Evangelii, prorsus ignorant, non mirum est, si in ea re* etiam ut vera Dei cognitione ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ἡ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδία, Rom. 1, 21. Quam insipientiam, qui post revelatum Christum in ipso Christianismo imitantur, voluntarie caecutientes, multo magis fiunt ἀναπολόγητοι.

XXIX Nam quod ex veteribus aut novis Scripturis afferunt,[a] jam ostendimus, nonnullis magni nominis Pontificiis, certam probationem* non facere, Matt. 5, 25. et Luc. 12, 58. praeceptum dat Christus, *de consentiendo cum adversario dum sumus in via, etc.* quem locum ad purgatorium probandum* detorquet Bellarminus lib. 1. *De Purgat.* c. 7. per totum caput.[b] At vero Maldonatus[c] et Barradius Jesuitae[d] nihil tale viderunt. Hic sensum Chrysostomi secutus Harm. Evang. Tom. 2. lib. 7. cap. 17.[e] haec verba ad reconciliationis festinationem et dissolvendas lites refert. Ille vero dum allegorice interpretatur, cum Augustino censet particulam *donec*, non significare,* ut ait Augustinus, *exituros postea, sed nunquam exituros, quia qui in inferno sunt, cum debitas poenas semper solvant, nunquam persolvunt.*[f] Ergo agnoscunt, fratrem suum Bellarminum, magno conatu, nihil nisi magnas nugas egisse.

XXX Idem Bellarminus c. 8. urget locum Matt. 5, 22.[g] *Qui irascitur fratri suo*, etc. ut ostendat, poenas aliquas temporales post hanc vitam luendas reservari. At Maldonatus[h] ex Judaeorum libris, omnes illas poenas fuisse capitales ostendit, et Christum gradus distinguere, non genus*: Itaque eadem poena inferni plectendos de quibus loquitur Christus, non eadem poenae gravitate dignos. Emanuel Sa habet aliam interpretationem, sed aeque purgatorio adversam, ut sensus sit: *doctrina Scribarum condemnat homicidam, ego vero etiam irascentem; illi dicentem Raca seu fatuum, ad concilium vocant, ego vero in infernum*

---

[a] Nam quod ex Scripturis V. aut N. Test. afferunt: 1642. [b] Bellarmine, *De Purgatorio* 1.7 (Opera 3:72a–75a). [c] Juan de Maldonado, *Commentarii in quatuor evangelistas* 1:121. [d] Sebastianus Barradius, *Commentaria in concordiam et historiam evangelicam*, 4 vols. ([Cologne]: Mylius, 1601–1627), 2:451. [e] Chrysostom, *Commentarius in sanctum Matthaeum evangelistam*, Hom. 15 (MPG 57:226). [f] The quotation is taken from Juan de Maldonado, *Commentarii in quatuor evangelistas* 1:121. A corresponding reference to Augustine has not been found. [g] Bellarmine, *De Purgatorio* 1.8 (*Opera* 3:75). [h] Juan de Maldonado, *Commentarii in quatuor evangelistas* 1:117–119.

the teaching of the Gospel, it is no surprise if in this matter* (just as in the true knowledge of God) "they have become futile in their thinking, and their senseless hearts have been darkened" (Romans 1:21). And those who copy such folly within the Christian realm, who after Christ was revealed to them are being willfully blind, are all the more "without excuse" [Romans 1:20].

For we have already shown that what they produce from the Scriptures (both 29
the Old and New Testaments) does not make for solid proof* in the eyes of some papal teachers of great renown. In Matthew 5:25 and Luke 12:58 Christ gives instruction about "reconciling with your opponent while we are on the way, etc.,"[47] a passage which Bellarmine twists into proof* for purgatory (*On Purgatory*, book 1, chapter 7, throughout the entire chapter). But in fact the Jesuits Maldonado and Barradas[48] saw nothing of the sort. In the *Harmony of the Gospels* (volume 2, book 7, chapter 17) the latter follows the opinion of Chrysostom and relates these words to hurrying up to reconcile and to solving lawsuits. But the former, since he explains it allegorically, together with Augustine thinks that the particle 'until' does not signify* (to use Augustine's words) "that they will go out afterwards, but that they will never go out, because those who are in hell never make full atonement for the penalties they owed, although they are always atoning for penalties." And so they acknowledge that their own brother Bellarmine has with his great efforts achieved nothing but great trifles.

The same Bellarmine (chapter 8) presses the passage in Matthew 5:22, "who- 30
ever is angry with his brother" etc., in order to show that some temporal punishments are held back so that they may be paid after this life. But Maldonatus shows from the books of the Jews that all of those punishments were capital ones, and that Christ is making a distinction in degree, not in kind.* And therefore that those about whom Christ is speaking will be struck by the same hellish punishments as those who do not deserve the same degree of punishment. Manoel de Sá[49] has a different interpretation, but one that is equally opposed to purgatory, so that the sense is: 'the Scribes' teaching condemns the murderer, but I condemn even the man who is angry; they call the man who says "Raca" or "you fool" before their council, but I consign him to hell.' About the other

47 This instruction is followed by the warning that else you will not get out of prison "until you have paid the very last penny" (Luke 12:59), a text applied to purgatory by some.

48 The Portuguese Jesuit Sebastião Barradas (1543–1615) taught exegesis at Coimbra and Évora and published a commentary on a harmony of the gospels (1599–1611).

49 Manuel de Sá (1530–1596) was a Portuguese Jesuit who taught philosophy and theology at Coimbra and Gandia. His exegetical works emphasize the literal sense of Scripture and include an explanation of John and annotations on the whole Bible.

mitto.[a] De reliquis locis quos in hunc finem producunt, in genere hoc dicimus, quod sint Apocryphi et extra Canonem, vel prorsus alieni, vel violenter detorti, vel plane depravati, nec ex omnibus esse unicum, qui nomen* purgatorii exprimat, vel definitionem ejus qualemcunque contineat. Sufficiat aliquod specimen hic exhibuisse, cetera ex disputatione patebunt.

XXXI Quae in eam rem citant ex Patribus et Conciliis, non possunt* articulum fidei extra Scripturam constituere, id tamen in genere monemus, 1. Citari a Pontificiis in hac causa multa suppositia scripta. 2. Plerosque auctores ab ipsis productos, vel purgatorii nullam mentionem facere, vel si qui sint qui purgatorii meminerint, illud prorsus aliter describere quam fit a Pontificiis; et praeterea neminem esse inter veteres Scriptores priorum seculorum genuinos, qui pro articulo fidei doctrinam de loco aliquo purgatorio voluerit obtrudere. Ipse Bellarmin. fatetur lib. 2. *De Purgat*. c. 1.[b] *multos Patres* putasse, purgari debere post hanc vitam omnes tam bonos quam malos, excepto Christo. Origenes qui inter primos purgatorium ignem accendit, purgat in eo flagitiosos, sacrilegos, qui in suis sceleribus vitam finierunt, teste August. *De Haeres*. cap. 43.[c] Augustinus autem dubius haesit, non solum in qualitate* poenarum sed etiam in re* ipsa. *Tale aliquid etiam post hanc vitam fieri incredibile est, et utrum ita sit, quaeri potest, Enchirid*. c. 69.[d] Et alibi, *non redarguo, quia forsitan verum est*, lib. 21. *De civit. Dei*, cap. 26.[e]

XXXII Inepta est consequentia, quam tamen velut firmam et extra controversiam ponunt, nempe eos omnes purgatorium credidisse, qui orationes et oblationes pro mortuis commendarunt, et earum utilitatem negantes, inter haereticos reposuerunt. Nam etsi verum sit, consuetudinem orandi pro mortuis antiquam esse; certum est nihilominus, veteres alias habuisse causas cur id utile esse duxerint. Cum Ecclesia etiam Graeca, *usque in hodiernum diem, consuetudinem illam servet, et tamen usque in hodiernum diem purgatorium non est a Graecis creditum*, ait Alphonsus de Castro Lib. 8. de Indulg.[f]

---

[a] Manuel de Sá, *Notationes in totam scripturam sacram* (Lyon: Cordon, 1609), 401a. [b] Bellarmine, *De Purgatorio* 2.1 (*Opera* 3:97a). [c] Augustine, *De haeresibus* 43 (CCSL 46:310–311). [d] Augustine, *Enchiridion* 18.69 (CCSL 46:87). [e] Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 21.26 (CCSL 48:799). [f] Alfonso de Castro, *Adversus omnes haereses* (Paris: Vascosanus, 1541), 147[r]. From 1642 the text has: Lib. 8. advers. Haeres. Tit. de Indulg.

passages which they produce for this purpose we make the general statement that they are apocryphal and extra-canonical, or entirely unrelated, or forcefully twisted, or altogether distorted, and that there is not even a single one of them that represents the word* 'purgatory' or that contains any definition of it at all. Let it suffice to have shown one example here; the remainder will become clear in the disputation.[50]

31 And what they cite for the same purpose from the church fathers and the councils cannot* constitute an additional article of faith besides Scripture; even so, we provide this general advice: 1) In this case the papal teachers cite many spurious writings. 2) Very many authors they themselves adduced either make no mention of purgatory, or if there are those who do bring purgatory to mind they depict it as entirely different than the papal teachers do. 3) Moreover, there is not anyone among the genuine, older writers of earlier ages who wished to push the teaching of some purgatorial place as an article of faith. Bellarmine himself admits (*On Purgatory*, book 2, chapter 1) that "many fathers thought that after this life all people—good as well as wicked—had to be cleansed, with the exception of Christ." Origen, who was among the first to light the fire of purgatory, has people purified in it who are miscreants, sacrilegious, who in the midst of their crimes put an end to their lives (witness Augustine, *On Heretics*, chapter 43). But Augustine did hesitate and doubt, not only over the nature* of the punishments but also over the matter* itself: "It is unbelievable that something like this happens also after this life, and one could question whether it is so" (*Enchiridion*, chapter 69). And elsewhere: "I do not argue against it, because perhaps it is true" (*City of God*, book 21, chapter 26).

32 And although they posit it as certain and beyond debate, the consequence they draw is a foolish one, namely that all those who promoted prayers and offerings on behalf of the deceased believed in purgatory. And they put those people who deny the usefulness of prayers and offerings in the company of heretics. For even if it is true that the custom of praying for the deceased is an old one, it is no less certain that the ancients had different reasons for considering it useful. For even the Greek church, Alphonso de Castro[51] says, "has that custom until today, and yet to this very day the Greeks do not believe in purgatory" ([*Against Heresies*,] On Indulgences, book 8).

---

50 This may be a reference to the forthcoming oral defense of the disputation.

51 The Franciscan theologian and jurist Alfonso de Castro (1495–1558) was professor at Salamanca and a counsellor of Charles V and the Spanish king Philip II. He took part in the Council of Trent and ended his career as a preacher in Antwerp. His work *Against Heresies* offers an alphabetical discussion of more than four hundred forms of heresy and became influential in the Roman Catholic persecution in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

XXXIII Ratio* igitur primaria, cur pro mortuis preces fuderint, ab ea doctrina profecta est, quam ipsi Pontificii hoc tempore inter errores recensent; nempe *quod tot illi et tam celebres antiqui Patres, Tertullianus, Irenaeus, Origenes, Chrysostomus, Theodoretus, Ambrosius, Clemens Romanus, Bernardus, huic sententiae* (*quae in concilio Florentino, magna conquisitione facta, ut dogma fidei definita* est*) quod justorum animae ante diem judicii Dei visione fruuntur, non sunt assensi, sed sententiam contrariam tradiderunt*, fatente Staplet. *De auctor. Scrip*. l. 1. c. 2. sect. 5.[a] Quibus addit Sixtus Senensis, Justinum Martyrem, Lactantium, Victorinum, Prudentium, Aretham etc. *Bibl*. lib. 6. annot. 345.[b] Non mirum est

[a] Thomas Stapleton, *Authoritatis ecclesiasticae circa s. scripturarum approbationem* (Antwerp: J. Keerbergius, 1592), 80 (1.2.5). [b] Sixtus of Siena, *Bibliotheca sancta*, 2nd ed. (Cologne: Maternus Cholinus, 1576), 617–621.

And in fact the primary reason* why they poured out prayers for the deceased stems from the very doctrine that nowadays the papal teachers themselves consider among the errors, namely "that so many and such illustrious ancient fathers as Tertullian, Irenaeus, Origen, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Ambrose, Clement of Rome, and Bernard did not agree with this line of thinking (which the council of Florence, upon extensive discussion, determined* to be a dogma of faith), that the souls of the righteous enjoy beholding God before judgment day;[52] but they taught the opposite line of thinking," as Stapleton admits (*On the Authority of* [*the Church Regarding the Holy*] *Scriptures*, book 1, chapter 2, section 5). And to these Sixtus of Siena[53] adds Justin Martyr, Lactantius,[54] Victorinus,[55] Prudentius,[56] Arethas,[57] etc. (*Bibliotheca Sancta*, book 6, 33

52 One of the questions at the Council of Florence (1439) was about the time of the beatific vision: do the souls of the departed just immediately enjoy the beatific vision after death or is the vision postponed till the last judgment and the resurrection? The question had been subject of a fierce controversy in the fourteenth century when Pope John XXII stated the souls of the blessed do not enjoy the beatific vision immediately upon death, but only at the end of times. He recanted just before he died, and the view that the blessed souls enjoy the beatific vision immediately after death—or after a period in purgatory—was officially promulgated by his successor Benedict XII in 1336 (DH 1000) and confirmed by the Council of Florence (DH 1305). See further Carol Walker Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200–1336* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), 279–290 and Decima Douie, "John XXII and the Beatific Vision," *Dominican Studies* 3 (1950): 154–174. Rivetus argues that if one assumes that the eternal hellish verdict is not given until the resurrection, it would indeed make sense to pray for the dead, although that prayer can only apply to the eternal punishment of the final judgment, not to the temporal punishment in purgatory. Consequently, praying for the dead cannot be supported by an appeal to the fathers whose views were rejected.

53 The converted Jew, Sixtus of Siena (1520–1569), became a Franciscan theologian. He coined the term deuterocanonical for the books in the Septuagint that were not included in the Tanach. In the *Bibliotheca sancta* he discusses the authors of Scripture and the best way of translating and explaining the Bible. This list of authors was used commonly in Protestant polemics against purgatory.

54 Lactantius or Lucius Caecilius Firmianus (c. 250–c. 320) the advisor to the Christian emperor Constantine, was a native of the Roman province of Africa, a teacher of rhetoric and an apologist.

55 Victorinus († 304), bishop of Poetovio or Ptuj in Slovenia, is the author of the oldest preserved Latin Bible commentary, in which he interprets the Book of Revelation. Little is known about his life but he probably died during the persecutions of Diocletian.

56 Prudentius (348–c. 413) was an important Christian poet, whose work is influenced by early Christian writers such as Tertullian and Ambrose.

57 Arethas (c. 860–944), who became archbishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia in 901, was one

igitur, si in hac *resurrectionis mora*, quam vocat Tertullianus,[a] et animarum omnium exilio et poena damni (non utique sensus) preces mortuis utiles esse censuerunt. Quod fundamentum* cum ipsi Pontificii ruinosum esse censeant, non debuimus, qui aliter ex Scriptura edocti sumus, ritum inutilem, et sanctis etiam injuriosum, imitari.

XXXIV Probationis* genus* ab apparitionibus animarum, quae se in purgatorio esse renunciarunt, opemque a vivis implorare visae sunt, ad fabulas commentitias referimus, vel ad somnia phreneticorum, abreptitiorum, et morbis oppressorum; ad dolos item diabolicos saepe retectos, quibus decipi meruerunt, qui *Deum suum non consuluerunt, sed pro viventibus mortuos*, Esai. 8, 19. Hujus caecitatis exemplum praebet ipse Bellarminus delirans, lib. 2. *De gemitu columbae*, cap. 9.[b] ubi ex Beda fabulam recitat de visione cujusdam Drithelmi, qui vallem viderat animabus hominum plenam, in qua unum latus erat flammis ferventibus terribile, alterum autem furenti grandine, ac frigore nivium omnia perflante; ibidemque miseras animas, cum vim fervoris tolerare non possent, in medium frigoris infesti prosilientes, et rursum frigore rigentes, in medias flammas infelici vicissitudine redeuntes. *Quam historiam*, inquit, *verissimam esse non dubito, quia Scripturae consentanea est, dicenti in libro Job*. cap. 24. *Ad nimium calorem transeunt ab aquis nivium*. Aliam ibidem refert, magis anilem

[a] Tertullian, *De anima* 58.8 (CCSL 2:869). [b] Bellarmine, *De gemitu columbae siue De bono lacrymarum libri tres* 2.9 (*Opera* 8:447–448).

of the most learned theologians of the Orthodox Church. 901 he became Archbishop of Caesarea.

annotation 345). It is not surprising if in this "delay in the resurrection" (as Tertullian calls it)[58] they considered the prayers for the deceased useful, because of this exile of all the souls and penalty of punishment of damnation (though not a punishment of the senses).[59] And the fact that the papal teachers themselves consider the basis* to be an unstable one, we—who have been taught differently by Scripture—should not copy a rite that has no usefulness and is even harmful to the saints.

The kind* of proof* from the appearances of souls reporting that they have 34
been in purgatory, and who seem to be begging the living for help we relegate to forged fables, or to the dreams of the insane, the possessed, and those who have been afflicted by fevers. And we relegate them also to the often-disclosed deceits of the devil, deceits whereby people deserve to be fooled who "do not consult with God but with the dead on behalf of the living" (Isaiah 8:19). A delirious Bellarmine himself offers us an instance of such blind folly in *The Sighing Dove* (book 2, chapter 9) where he retells a story from Bede about the vision of a certain Dryhthelm[60] who had seen a valley filled with the souls of men whereof one side bristled with burning fires, and another with a raging hailstorm and icy-cold snows blowing everywhere. And there he saw wretched souls that when they could not bear the force of the heat would leap headlong into the middle of the cold; and then they would shiver in the cold and, in unhappy succession, return into the midst of the flames. He says, "I do not doubt that this account is very true because it agrees with Scripture, which says in Job chapter 24[:19]: 'they cross from ice-cold waters to excessive heat.'" The same author relates another story, more suited to old-wives and madwomen,

58 Tertullian writes about a place where sinners are jailed until 'later resurrection' and this was taken as a possible reference to purgatory, but the original meaning is ambiguous.

59 In medieval theology, punishment of damnation (*poena damni*) is the lack of the beatific vision, due to the aversion from God himself. Punishment of the senses (*poena sensus*) is the corporeal and emotional torment, due to the conversion to a created, lesser good than God himself; cf. *DLGTT* s.v. "poena" and *SPT* 16.22, note 12. The distinction was taken over by the Reformed; see, for instance, Van Asselt and Van den Brink, *Scholastic Discourse*, 266.

60 In his *History of the English Church* (book 5, chapter 13) Bede writes that Dryhthelm, who lived in the eighth century in Northumbria, temporarily died before becoming a monk. When he came back to life he recalled a vision in which he had seen hell, purgatory, and heaven. Thus Judith McClure and Roger Collins (eds), *The Ecclesiastical History of the English People* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 253–258. See also Andrew Rabin, "Bede, Dryhthelm, and the Witness to the Other World: Testimony and Conversion in the *Historia Ecclesiastica*," *Modern Philology* 106/3 (2009): 375–398.

et insanam, de quadam Christina, quae post mortem ab Angelis in Paradisum delata, et a Deo optione data aeternum apud eum manendi, aut in terras redeundi, ut gravissimas poenas perferret pro liberandis animabus purgatorii, elegit conditionem patiendi, ea lege ut multis meritis aucta, rediret ad Deum. Illa vero postea ingrediebatur in ardentes clibanos, cruciabatur, horrendos edebat clamores, et tandem egrediebatur illaesa. Sub aquis Mosae hiberno tempore, cum rigerent omnia gelu, sex et amplius diebus perdurabat. Imo sub ipsa rota moletrinae,[a] ubi horrendum in modum circumacta, membris omnibus manebat incolumis, etc. Haec diabolica esse praestigia quis sanus non videt? Et tamen, Ecce, inquit Bellarminus, *habemus testes fideles marem et feminam, qui viderunt purgatorii acerbissima supplicia, ut plane inexcusabiles sint qui ista non credunt*.[b] Sic enim *misit illis Deus efficaciam deceptionis ut credant mendacio, pro eo quod amorem veritatis non receperunt ut salvi fierent*, 2 Thess. 2, 10. 11.

XXXV Non minus frivolum est argumentum quod ab utili ducunt, quia qui cogitat remanere praeter gehennam ignem acerbissimum purgatorii, et quicquid hic per debita poenitentiae opera deletum non fuerit, ibi diluendum, diligentior cautiorque evadit, contra, opinio quae tollit purgatorium homines socordes facit in peccatis cavendis et in bonis operibus faciendis; quasi vero ii quos gehennae ignis non absterret, commentitium ignem sint moraturi, et non potius per inventum illud, peccandi ansa praebeatur iis, qui putant se ex flammis illis liberari posse per aliorum suffragia, quae ditiores facili negotio sibi possunt comparare, praesertim cum ipse sentent. Magister, *in purgatorio celeriorem absolutionem contingere diviti quam pauperi*, asserere non vereatur, lib. 4. *sent. dist.* 45. lit. D.[c] Et Albertus Magnus, *tot posse fieri suffragia pro uno aliquo,*

[a] molendini: original disputation. [b] Bellarmine, *De gemitu columbae siue De bono lacrymarum libri tres* 2.9 (*Opera* 8:449–450). [c] Lombard, *Sententiae* 4.45.

about a certain Christina[61] whom the angels carried to Paradise when she died, and God gave her the choice of staying with Him forever or returning to earth in order to complete the most grievous penalties for the sake of setting free souls from purgatory. She made the choice to suffer, with the stipulation that after she had amassed many merits she would return to God. And so thereupon she entered into burning ovens, was tormented, gave forth horrendous cries, and finally came out—unharmed. And during the winter she lasted six days and more under the waters of the Maas, when everything was frozen stiff with cold. What is more, all her limbs were unharmed when she was fastened to the wheel of a mill and turned around and around in a horrible manner, etc. What sane person does not see that those are the devil's deceptions? And still Bellarmine says: "Look, here we have trustworthy eye-witnesses, a man and a woman, who have seen the harshest punishments of purgatory, so that those who do not believe these things are clearly without excuse." For in this way "God has sent to them the power of deception to believe a lie, because they did not receive a love for the truth that they might be saved" (2 Thessalonians 2:10–11).

And no less fanciful is the argument which they draw from utility, namely 35
that whoever thinks that besides hell there exists the fiercest fire of purgatory and that whatever has not been erased by the works that were owed for penitence must be atoned for there, lives with greater zeal and caution, while the opinion that takes away purgatory instead makes men careless in avoiding sin and in performing good works. As though those people who are undeterred by hell-fire will care at all about an imaginary fire, and as though that [imaginary fire] will not rather give an opportunity for sin to those who think that they can free themselves from those flames by the help of others. This help wealthier people can obtain for themselves by an easy business deal. And especially the 'Master of Sentences' himself doesn't fear to make the claim that "in purgatory the wealthy obtain forgiveness more quickly than the poor" (*Sententiae*, book 4, distinction 45, letter D).[62] And Albertus Magnus[63] says that "there can

61 Bellarmine refers to the account of the thirteenth century Dominican, Thomas de Cantimpré who wrote a life of Christina Mirabilis or Christina the Astonishing, who arose from her coffin at her funeral and reported that she had been to hell, to purgatory, and to heaven where she was offered the choice of remaining with God or returning to earth to suffer on behalf of the souls she had seen in purgatory. See Barbara Newman and Margot H. King (eds.), *Thomas of Cantimpré: The Collected Saints' Lives: Abbot John of Cantimpré, Christina the Astonishing, Margaret of Ypres, and Lutgard of Aywières* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008).

62 Rivetus refers loosely to Peter Lombard's *Sententiae*, omitting his remark that the wealthy do not obtain forgiveness more fully than the poor.

63 Albertus Magnus, or Albert the Great (c. 1200–1280), was a Dominican friar, a bishop, and a theologian who taught in Cologne. His "Double Treatise" containing *De mysterio missae*

quod statim in momento liberetur, et ideo in hoc casu meliorem esse conditionem divitis quam pauperis, qui habet unde suffragia fiant pro ipso, unde Prov. 13. dicitur, Redemptio viri divitiae ejus, de offic. *Miss. tract*. 3. cap. 16.[a] Inde certe non aucta est pietas, sed aucti sunt Ecclesiasticorum reditus, qui *in avaritia fictis verbis de hominibus negotiantur*, 2 Pet. 2, 3. dum interim illi ipsi qui purgatorium urgent, bacchanalia vivunt, quod Romae fieri, ubi purgatorii doctrina maxime viget, non solum historiae testantur, sed ipsa clamat experientia.

XXXVI Quae cum ita sint, concludimus, purgatorium nec ex Scripturis auctoritatem, nec ex testimonio* Patrum fidem, nec ex rationibus probabilitatem ullam habere, quale praesertim a Pontificiis creditur, apud quos aedificium illud partibus suis non cohaeret, sed variis incommodis et contradictionibus involvitur; quod verum esse, non solum ex iis quae hactenus dicta sunt, cuivis patebit, sed etiam adversariorum libros legenti praesertim Bellarmini, in quibus vix unum aut alterum caput occurrit, in quo non diversae, saepissime etiam adversae scriptorum Pontificiorum opiniones et fundamenta* recitentur; quibus digladiantibus inter se, nos grato animo in sola Christi satisfactione acquiescemus, certo statuentes nullum esse post hanc vitam ignem purgatorium extimescendum iis, qui in Christo vitae auctore firmiter acquiescunt.

DE INDULGENTIIS.

XXXVII Exstincto purgatorii igne, indulgentiarum fumus per se evanescit; sublato enim purgatorio, vix reperietur qui eas, etiam oblatas, accipere velit. Ideo Roffensis Episcopus Artic. 13. contra Lutherum,[b] cum Indulgentiarum originem incertam videret, et sero admodum apud Christianos fuisse receptas fateretur, causam hanc afferebat, *quod de purgatorio apud priscos nulla vel rarissima fiebat mentio, quod ad hunc usque diem Graecis non est creditum. Quamdiu autem nulla fuit de purgatorio cura, neminem indulgentias quaesivisse, ex quo pendet omnis indulgentiarum aestimatio, quo sublato, indulgentiis opus non erit; neminem itaque mirari posse, quod in principio nascentis Ecclesiae* NULLUS *fuerit earum usus, cum purgatorium tam sero fuerit universae Ecclesiae cognitum*. Ipse Gregorius de Valentia concedit, *vigente* apud veteres *poenitentia severiore, non*

[a] Albertus Magnus, *Liber de sacrificio missae* 3.16 in *Opera omnia*, 38 vols. (Paris: Vives, 1890–1900), 38:135a. [b] John Fisher, *Assertionis Lutheranae confutatio*, 314 (art. 18).

and *De corpore domini* was very popular in the Middle Ages. Thomas Aquinas was his most famous student.

be so much assistance for any one person that he is immediately set free in a moment of time, and that therefore in this matter the wealthy man's state is better than that of the poor, as he has the wherewithal for assistance to come in his own behalf, whence Proverbs 13[:8] says: 'A rich man's wealth is his ransom'" (*On the Mystery of the Office of the Mass*, treatise 3, chapter 16). Hence it surely is not piety that is increased by this, but instead the incomes of the churches' clerics, who "in their greed exploit people with lying words" (2 Peter 2:3), and while those people stress purgatory, they themselves are living lives of debauchery. Not only do reports bear witness to the fact that this is happening at Rome (where the doctrine of purgatory is doing exceptionally well) but also experience itself speaks loud and clear.

36 This being the case, it is our conclusion that purgatory does not have any authority from Scriptures, not any credibility based on the testimonies* of the fathers, nor any likelihood based on logical arguments,* such as especially the papal teachers believed, in whose writings the components do not hold the building together, which is bound up in a variety of ill-fitting and contradictory elements. It will be obvious to everyone that this statement is true, not just from the things that we have said thus far, but even when one reads the books of our opponents (especially Bellarmine) wherein one scarcely meets one or two chapters which do not cite divers opinions and principles* that very often even contradict the writings of the papal teachers. And while they are crossing swords with each other, we rest with grateful hearts in the sole satisfaction of Christ, stating with certainty that those who firmly abide in Christ as the author of life should not be afraid of any purgatorial fire after this life.

On Indulgences

37 Once the fire of purgatory has been extinguished, the smoke of indulgences vanishes by itself. For with the removal of purgatory scarcely anyone will be found who would accept indulgences, even if they were offered for free. Accordingly the bishop of Rochester in *Against Luther* (article 13) when he saw that the origin of indulgences is not certain and admitted that it was only lately that Christians had accepted them as true, he brought forward the following reason: "That the ancients make no, or very little, mention of purgatory, and that until this very day the Greeks do not believe in it. And as long as there was no concern about purgatory, no-one looked for indulgences, on which every evaluation of indulgences depends, and if that is removed, there will be no need for indulgences. And therefore no-one can be surprised that at the start of the growing church there was no use for them, since it was so late that purgatory became known to the universal church." Gregory of Valencia himself admits that "since the practice of penitence was thriving more pointedly among the

magnopere fuisse necessarium beneficio indulgentiarum uti, postea vero decrescente illo poenitentiae fervore, illarum usum increbrescere coepisse, *Tract. de Indulg*. cap. 4.[a]

XXXVIII[a] Ultro etiam concedunt alii, non solum *non esse aperta Scripturae testimonia** *de Indulgentiis*, et suos *admonent Catholicos, ne minus certis innitantur, sed addunt* insuper, se *antiquae et primitivae Ecclesiae non habere certa testimonia: traditionem Apostolicam se in hac materia non habere*, sed tantum Romanae Ecclesiae et quorundam Conciliorum (recentium nempe) auctoritatem, ut videre est apud Petrum a Soto, in *Instructione Sacerd. Lect. 1. de Indulg*.[c] qui nihilominus doctrinam suam de lndulgentiis tamquam fidei articulum obtrudunt, quas definiunt, *Relaxationes poenarum temporalium, judicio divino peccatis actualibus post remissam culpam debitarum, per applicationem superabundantium Christi et Sanctorum satisfactionum, factam extra Sacramentum** *ab eo qui legitimam auctoritatem habet*. Greg. de Valent. Tom. 4. disp. 7. quaest. 20. punct. 1.[d]

XXXIX Quam definitionem si ex sensu eorum explicemus, et uniuscujusque partis vanitatem indicemus, paucis materiam alioquin intricatam absolvemus. De nomine* ipsis gratiam faciemus, quod plerumque in partem deteriorem accipitur, quod tamen, omine non bono, in hac materia usurparunt, in qua *Blanda patrum segnes facit indulgentia natos*, ut boni patres habeant quo possint genio

[a] Gregory of Valencia, *Disputatio de indulgentiis* (Ingolstadt: Sartorius, 1587), 30. [b] The original numbering of 1625 repeats XXXVII and therefore numbers the following theses incorrectly. [c] Petrus de Soto, *Tractatus de institutione sacerdotum*, 243$^{r–v}$. [d] Gregory of Valencia, *Commentarii theologici* 4:1845–1846.

ancients, there was no great need to have the benefit of indulgences, but that later, when that fervor of penitence diminished, the use of indulgences began to increase" (*Treatise on Indulgences*, chapter 4).

38 And besides, there are others who even admit not only "that there are no clear testimonies* in Scripture about indulgences, and they advise their fellow Catholics not to rely on things that are less certain, but they also add that they do not have certain testimonies of the early, primitive church, and that in this matter they do not have the apostolic tradition" but only the authority of the Roman church and of some (actually recent) councils—as may be seen in the writings of Peter de Soto, in his *Lectures on the Institution of Priesthood* (*On Indulgences*, lecture 1). Nevertheless, they push their doctrine about indulgences as an article of faith, and define it as "the exemptions from temporal punishments that in God's judgment are owed for actual sins after the guilt has been forgiven, through the application of the excess deeds of satisfaction of Christ and the saints, done apart from the sacrament* by someone who has the lawful authority to do so" (Gregory of Valencia, volume 4,[64] disputation 7, question 20.1).

39 If we explain this definition according to their intended meaning and point out the folly of each individual part, we shall untie an otherwise knotty topic in a few words. We shall give them the benefit as far as the name* ['indulgence'] is concerned, because for the most part the name is understood in a more pejorative sense. Even so, they use it for this subject-matter in an inauspicious way, as in 'the loving indulgence of fathers makes their children slothful,'[65] so that

64 This is the same volume as in thesis 3 above, but here the reference is to the 4th volume of Gregory's series, whereas in thesis 3 the reference is to the 3rd part of Aquinas's *Summa*.

65 This Latin equivalent of "spare the rod, spoil the child" appears commonly in dictionaries of proverbs, and seems to originate with the Carmelite poet St. John Baptist de Mantua (Baptista Mantuanus; 1447–1516) in line 169 of his first *Parthenice mariana*; see *Fratris Baptiste Mantuani Carmelite theologi, oratoris et poete clarissimi prima Parthenice que Mariana inscribitur* (Nürnberg: Friedrich Peypus, 1516), Aiiii v° and Wilhelm Binder, *Novus thesaurus adagiorum latinorum: Lateinischer Sprichwörterschatz* (Stuttgart: Eduard Fischhaber, 1861), 38 (#346). Here Rivetus appears to be referring to the fact that the papal scholars themselves admitted the pejorative associations of the word 'indulgence.' One example is Melchior de Flavin (?–1580), who in his discussion of indulgences noted the general negative use of the verb 'to indulge' as witnessed in the Latin proverb above (which he cites), only to add: "Theologians, however, use it with another meaning." See Melchior de Flavin, *Resolutiones in quatuor libros* (Paris: Guillaume de la Nouë, 1579), 327. Heinrich Bullinger already quoted the proverb in the context of his discussion of indulgences, arguing that these indulgences "have utterly corrupted true repentance" in his *Decades* (4.2); see Heinrich Bullinger, *Schriften*, ed. Emidio Campi et al., 6 vols. (Zürich: Theologischer

indulgere. *Nam indulgentiae fiunt ad relevandum indigentiam Ecclesiae, quae non relevatur per solam voluntatem* dandi, sed per datum*, Augustin. de Ancona *De potestate Pap*. quaest. 30. artic. 3.[a] dant igitur ut accipiant, nec indulgent gratis. Dicunt esse *relaxationes poenarum temporalium*, etc. quibus verbis fundamentum* primum hujusce nundinationis detegitur, nempe doctrina de poenis quibusdam temporalibus. satisfactoriis, ab homine poenitente, cui remissa est culpa, per gratiam* Dei, adhuc debitis, et in hac vita vel in purgatorio exsolvendis; quod fundamentum a nobis subversum est supra, Thess. 32. 33. 34. 35. ut hic non sit opus actum agere.

XL In eo autem se prodit Pontificiorum Doctorum κυβεία, quod ut probent,* fideles post remissam culpam obnoxios adhuc manere poenis temporalibus aut actu* luendis, aut per Indulgentias relaxandis; cum ad rem ventum est, coguntur fateri nullam poenam posse* per indulgentias relaxari ex iis quas aliquando probant* ex Scripturis, nonnullis fidelibus fuisse inflictas, ut Davidi et similibus; sed poenas tantum fictitias purgatorii, aut ab hominibus injunctas, aut quae injungi debuerunt vel ultro suscipi. Non solum ergo indulgentiae non absolvunt a reatu culpae ullius, mortalis vel venialis, sed neque a poenis naturalibus,* quales sunt morbi, mors, ignorantia, concupiscentia et similes; neque etiam a poenis quae in foro externo et contentioso, tam Ecclesiastico quam politico infligi possunt; sed tantum poenam tollunt quae debetur in foro secreto et poenitentiali, secundum Bellarm. lib. 1. *De indulg*. cap. 7.[b]

[a] Augustine of Ancona, *Summa de potestate ecclesiastica* (Rome: Ferrarius, 1584), 183. [b] Bellarmine, *De indulgentiis* 1.7 (*Opera* 7:33–36).

Verlag, 2004), 4:358. There are also slight variants on the Latin proverb which replace *segnes* with *reprobos* or *pravos*.

'good fathers' have it in them to indulge their nature. "For indulgences came about in order to lighten the church of its poverty, which is not lightened only by the will* to give but by the gift" (Augustine of Ancona, *On the Sovereignty of the Pope*, question 30, article 3).[66] Therefore they give in order to receive, and they do not indulge for nothing. When they say that indulgences are "the exemptions from temporal punishments, etc.," the words expose the primary basis* for this business transaction, i.e., concerning some temporal, satisfactorial punishments of a penitent man whose guilt has been forgiven by God's grace* but to whom punishments are still owed and which must be paid either in this life or in purgatory. We overturned this basis above, in theses 32–35, so that this need not be done at this point.

But the gamble of the papal teachers gives itself away when they prove* that 40
after their guilt has been forgiven believers still remain subject to temporal punishments either by actually* paying for them or by obtaining exemption by means of indulgences. When it comes to the point, they are compelled to admit that no exemption via indulgences is possible* for penalties on the basis of the indulgences they sometimes show* from Scriptures as imposed on some believers such as David and the like. But the artificial penalties of purgatory are either ones that people commanded, or have to command, or undertake willingly. Therefore indulgences not only do not absolve from the liability of any mortal or venial guilt, but they also do not absolve from any natural penalties such as diseases, death, ignorance, concupiscence, and similar things. And they also do not absolve even from the punishments that can be inflicted by the outward, the litigious forums (ecclesiastical as well as political). But they can only remove the penalty that is owed in the hidden forum[67] of one's repentance, according to Bellarmine (*On Indulgences*, book 1, chapter 7).[68]

---

66 The Augustinian friar Augustine of Ancona or Augustinus Triumphus (1270–1328) is known chiefly for his *Summa on ecclesiastical power*, written by the end of 1326, a systematic argument for the supreme power of the pope.

67 The *forum internum* or the tribunal of one's personal conscience is distinguished from the *forum externum*, the public ecclesiastical tribunal.

68 In this thesis Rivetus rather closely follows Bellarmine who states that indulgences save people only from punishment for personal sin (*poena personalis*) and not from the natural punishment (*poena naturalis*) for original sin: illness, death, ignorance, concupiscence, etc. He further divides the punishment for personal sin in the penalties pronounced by an external, ecclesiastical or secular court—primarily of a confessor, and only secondarily of an ecclesiastical or secular court—and penalties imposed by the internal court of the personal conscience. Only the second are absolved by indulgences, and Bellarmine again divides them in punishments people themselves impose and those they should impose on themselves. See Bellarmine, *On Indulgences* 1.4 (*Opera* 7:33–36).

XLI Ex quibus manifestum est, plerisque, qui magno emunt has merces,[a] et magnificis promissionibus *plenariae et plenissimae indulgentiae* omnium peccatorum, addita saepe clausula a *poena et a culpa*, alliciuntur, accidere quod proverbio dicitur, ut pro *thesauris*, nihil habeant praeter *carbones*.[b] Nam quia poenae illae, quarum fit mentio Ps. 89. *Si peccaverint filii tui, visitabo in virga iniquitates eorum*, etc. et Ebr. 12. cum Apostolus dicit, *nos a Deo disciplinam accipere*, item 1 Cor. 11. *nos a Deo judicari et corripi*, infliguntur a Deo tamquam a judice *externo et criminali*, eas non tolli per indulgentiam, largitur Bellarm. lib. 2. *De indulg*. cap. 1.[c] sed tantum tolli poenam *quae in foro poenitentiario infligitur, ad quam implendam non cogimur nisi timore Dei, et stimulo conscientiae*. Ex quo manifeste patet, quod merito Lutherus[d] objecit, Indulgentias noxias esse, non salutares, cum a bonis operibus, jejuniis, eleemosynis, precibus, etc, nos impediant, imo *timorem Dei et stimulum conscientiae* excutiant. Nam *per indulgentias concessas satisfacit homo poenis impositis in confessione, ut si Confessarius imposuit ipsi disciplinam, jejunium, eleemosynam vel similia aliqua opera exercenda; si indulgentiam consequatur, non teneatur illas subire poenas*, Tolet. Instruct. Sacerd. Lib. 6. cap. 24.[e]

XLII Verum, ne frigesceret zelus eorum qui in indulgentiarum dispensatione majus aliquid quaerunt, accensae sunt purgatoriae flammae, quae terrorem incuterent; hoc addito μορμολυκείῳ, fore ut siquis imposita decem annorum poena, ea non impleta obiret, ut in purgatorio acerbissima poena puniretur, a qua liber in coelum evolaret recta, si bullis indulgentiae plenissimae probe instructus, eas janitori coelorum exhiberet. Hinc esse quod plurium millium annorum indulgentiae concedantur, quia etsi tempus hoc longe excedat hominis vitam, tamen cum pro uno mortali peccato injungenda sit poena septem annorum, et accidere possit multis, ut plura peccata mortalia, quam mille commiserint, qui secundum Canones deberent septem annorum millia, si tot victuri essent, in poenitentia transigere; ipsis hoc modo provisum est, concessa

---

[a] hanc mercem: original disputation. [b] The proverb *carbonem, ut aiunt, pro thesauro invenimus* ("as the saying goes, in return for our treasure we have obtained coal") appears in Phaedrus, *Fabulae Aesopiae* 5.6.6; see Lucian Müller, *Phaedri Augusti Liberti Fabulae Aesopiae* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1873), 48. [c] Bellarmine, *De indulgentiis* 2.1 (*Opera* 7:59b). [d] The reference might be to Luther's 95 theses in which he states that indulgences are only useful for people if they do not put their trust in them, but become harmful if people lose their fear of God (thesis 49), *WA* 1, 229–238. [e] Francisco de Toledo, *De instructione sacerdotum et peccatis mortalibus* (Douai: Bellerus, 1608), 932 (6.23).

It is obvious from these observations that the many people who purchase 41
these wares at a great price and who have been enticed by the lofty promises of "fulsome and the fullest indulgence" for all sins (often with the added phrase, "from punishment and guilt") experience what the proverb says, that "in exchange for their treasures they possess nothing but coal." For because those punishments that are mentioned in Psalm 89[:32 and 33] ("If your sons sin, I shall punish their iniquities with the rod") and in Hebrews 12[:6] (when the apostle says, "we receive discipline from God") and also in 1 Corinthians 11[:32] ("God judges and instructs us") are inflicted upon us by God as the "external, criminal judge," Bellarmine grants that they are not taken away by indulgences (*On Indulgences*, book 2, chapter 1), but that only the penalty is removed "which is inflicted in the penitentiary forum, a penalty that we are driven to fulfill only by the fear of God and the goad of our own conscience." From this the objection which Luther rightly had made becomes very obvious, namely that indulgences are harmful, not beneficial, since they hinder us from doing good works (fasting, almsgiving, prayers) and in fact dispel "the fear of God and the goad of our own conscience." For "by means of permitted indulgences man makes satisfaction for the penalties that were imposed in confession, so that in case the Confessor imposed upon him a discipline, fasting, almsgiving, or some similar works to be performed, if he obtains the indulgence he is not bound to undergo the penalties" ([Francisco de] Toledo, *Instructions for Priests*, book 6, chapter 24).[69]

But so that the zeal of those who in the dispensing of indulgences seek some- 42
thing greater should not grow cold, they stoked the flames of purgatory in order to inflict terror. And so the following 'fear-factor' was added: if it should happen that someone dies before he has completed the penalty of ten years that has been imposed, he will be punished with the fiercest penalty in purgatory, but from there he would fly as a free man to heaven if, properly equipped with letters of the fullest indulgence, he should show them to the gate-keeper of heaven. Hence it is that indulgences are granted for many thousands of years, because even if this time by far surpasses a man's life-time, still for one mortal sin a penalty of seven years must be imposed and it can happen to many people that they have committed more than one thousand mortal sins, who according to the canonical rules should spend seven thousand years in penitence if they were to have lived that many years. In this manner provision is made for them,

69 The Spanish Jesuit Francisco de Toledo (1532–1596) taught in Salamanca and Rome and was the first Jesuit cardinal. His *Summary of the Cases of Conscience or Instruction of the Priests* (1599) is divided into seven books and discusses priesthood, the sacraments, the Ten Commandments, and the precepts of the church.

indulgentia tot millium annorum, aequali[a] non solum, sed etiam superante poenitentiam, quam implere debuissent, si per tot annorum millia poenitentiam egissent. Quae portenta indicasse, refutasse est.

XLIII Ut autem suppeterent aliunde tot annis, et tam numerosis peccatorum temporalibus poenis satisfactiones, aliud etiam substratum est indulgentiis fundamentum,* nempe *superabundantium Christi et Sanctorum satisfactionum*, quas in thesauro suo conclusas servant Romani Pontifices, et reliqui Episcopi pro suo modulo, hoc supposito,* non solum Christi satisfactionem propter suam absolutam* infinitatem,* nullum praemium creatum condignum potuisse recipere, et quovis dato infinities majus meruisse, sed etiam, *non paucos sanctos homines, multo plura propter Deum et justitiam esse perpessos, quam exigeret reatus poenae temporalis, cui fuerunt obnoxii propter culpas ab ipsis commissas*,[b] quorum etiam nonnullos ab omni culpa eximunt. Haec simul mixta, in mortario suo contundunt, ut massam illam conficiant, cujus particulas per indulgentias dispensent.

XLIV Nos quidem, quicquid contra calumnientur, satisfactionem Domini nostri Jesu Christi esse inaestimabilem thesaurum, Ecclesiae Dei concreditum, sancte agnoscimus; quo vere poenitentibus, et in eum credentibus, dispensantur verae et coram Deo ratae indulgentiae, seu potius peccatorum plenissima remissio, ab omni poena et culpa, tam originalis peccati, quam actualium; sed asserimus, Pontificios huic Christi satisfactioni injuriam facere, dum, ut ipsi adjiciant hominum satisfactiones, eidem infinitatem* suam tollunt, cum eas *applicandas* censent *finito modo,* ut aliquid ipsis revera superaddatur, cum passiones Sanctorum illis adjunguntur*, ut loquitur Bellarm. *De indulg*. lib. 1. cap. 4.[c] Id autem dicimus, esse non solum infinito* finitum addere, sed toti nihil; quia quod de passionibus Sanctorum dicunt, eas nempe duplicem vim habuisse, unam *meritoriam*, aliam vero *satisfactoriam*, et quoad rationem meriti plenam accepisse mercedem, non quoad rationem satisfactionis, falsum est et ineptum; neutram enim habent rationem opera Sanctorum, sed satisfactoriam non habuisse, recte ex eo probat* Durandus,[d] quod Sanctorum intentio non fuerit,

---

[a] aequante: 1642. [b] Bellarmine, *De indulgentiis* 1.2 (*Opera* 7:21). [c] Bellarmine, *De indulgentiis* 1.4 (*Opera* 7:28). The plural *eas*, which seemingly refers to Christ's *satisfactio* (singular), can be explained from the fact that Bellarmine speaks about the *passiones* (plural) of Christ. [d] Durand of St. Pourçain, *In Sententias theologicas Petri Lombardi commentariorum* (Lyon: Guillaume Rouillé, 1563), fol. 304^{vb} (4.20.3).

namely by granting indulgence for so many thousands of years that is not only equal to but even surpasses the penitence they should have fulfilled if they had done thousands of years of penitence. To have pointed out these ominous signs is to have refuted them.

In order to supply satisfactions for so many years and for such countless 43
temporal punishments from another source, they also laid a second basis* for indulgences,[70] namely that of the "excess satisfactions of Christ and the saints," which the Roman popes, and the other bishops according to their lesser measure, keep locked up in their treasury,[71] on the assumption* that the satisfaction of Christ, being absolutely* infinite,* could not have received any equivalent created reward and had merited infinitely more than any reward that He had been given. [And also on the basis that] "many saintly men have suffered much more for the sake of God and righteousness than their liability to temporal punishment required, to which they were subject for the wrongs they had committed," and they redeem even some others from their every guilt. They put all these things together and poured them into their mixer to fashion that lump from which they could* dispense small pieces in the form of indulgences.

And as far as we are concerned, whatever slanderous charge they should 44
make against us, we piously acknowledge that the satisfaction of our Lord Jesus Christ is a treasury of invaluable worth that has been entrusted to the church of God. From this treasury are dispensed upon people who are truly penitent and believe in Him, indulgences that are real and valid in the sight of God, or rather the fullest remission of sins, remission from every penalty and guilt of original as well as actual sins. But we do assert that the papal teachers do injury to this satisfaction of Christ when, in order to add the satisfaction of men, they take away the limitless* quality of Christ's satisfaction, because they deem that "his satisfactions must be applied in a limited way* so that something may be added to them when the sufferings of the saints are linked to them," as Bellarmine says (*On Indulgences*, book 1, chapter 4). But we state that this not only adds a finite thing to what is infinite,* but nothing to what is entire, for it is false and foolish what they say about the sufferings of the saints, i.e., that they possess a double force. Of this double force one is "meritorious" while the other is "satisfactorial," and regarding the merit they have received their full reward, but not regarding the satisfaction. For the works of the saints have neither of these aspects. But even Durand rightly proves* that they did not have the satisfactorial quality from the fact that it was not the saints' intention to transfer the fruit of their

70 See thesis 21 above.

71 For the treasury of the church see *SPT* 33 antithesis 9, note 29.

fructum suarum passionum in alios transferre, quae intentio saltem necessaria fuisset; at talis intentio in Sanctis esse non potuit,* quae arrogans fuisset et blasphema.

XLV Si passiones Sanctorum essent pro aliis satisfactoriae et una cum sanguine Christi thesaurum constituerent, discrimen illud ab Apost. Ebr. 12, 24. inter sanguinem Christi et sanguinem Abelis institutum tolleretur, non *enim meliora loqueretur sanguis Christi quam sanguis Abel*, Heb. 12, 24. uterque enim poenae peccatorum remissionem impetraret. Frustra scripsisset Salomon, *Si sapiens eris, tibimet ipsi eris; si autem illusor, solus portabis malum*, Proverb. 19, 12. Neque in *semetipso tantum quis gloriam haberet et non in altero*, Gal. 6, 4. Nec ulla ratio* fuisset cur de Noacho, Daniele et Jobo diceret Deus per Ezechielem, cap. 14, 20. *quod filios suos et filias non liberarent, sed ipsi justitia sua liberarent animas suas*. Nullus unquam Sanctorum fuit, qui non acquievisset Tertulliano interroganti lib. *De Pudic*. cap. 22.[a] *Quis alienam mortem sua solvit, nisi solus Dei filius? proinde qui illum aemularis donando delicta, si nihil ipse deliquisti, patere pro me; si vero peccator es, quomodo oleum faculae tuae sufficere et tibi et mihi poterit?* Aut qui Augustino manum non dedisset, dicenti *Tract. 84. in Joh*.[b] *Etsi fratres pro fratribus moriantur, tamen in fraternorum peccatorum remissione, nullius sanguis martyris funditur*.

XLVI Neque propterea metuendum erit, ne passiones Sanctorum sint inanes, quae alios usus et fines* habent, de quibus nullum dubium potest moveri: ut autem sint inanes quatenus satisfactoriae, et sine tali fructu si egentibus non applicentur, nihil est incommodi; sic enim ne Pontificiis quidem repugnantibus, erunt inanes passiones omnium Sanctorum qui in die Domini manebunt superstites; et quae tum in thesauro Ecclesiae adhuc supererunt, quia tunc nulli erunt quibus dispensari possint, nisi forte existiment Pontificii, evacuato purgatorio, etiam futuras *sub styge ferias spiritibus nocentibus*,[c] aut eosdem etiam tandem

[a] Tertullian, *De pudicitia* 22.4–5 (SC 394:276). [b] Augustine, *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus CXXIV 84.2* (CCSL 36:537). [c] The quotation is from a hymne based on Prudentius, *Liber Cathemerinon* 5.125–126 (CSEL 61:30).

own sufferings unto others—an intention that would have been necessary, at least. But such an intention could not have existed for the saints, as it would have been a haughty and blasphemous one.

If the suffering of the saints were satisfactory for other people and together 45
with Christ's blood formed the treasury, then the distinction would be taken away that the apostle makes in Hebrews 12:24 between Christ's blood and the blood of Abel, for then "the blood of Christ would speak no more eloquently than the blood of Abel" (Hebrews 12:24). For then either one could have obtained forgiveness of the punishment for sins. And Solomon would have written in vain: "If you are wise, you are wise for yourself; but if you are a mocker, you alone will bear the evil" (Proverbs 9:12). Nor would "anyone boast only in himself and not boast in another" (Galatians 6:4). And there would not have been any reason* why God through Ezekiel (14:20) should say about Noah, Daniel and Job that "they did not set free their own sons and daughters, but by their righteousness they set free only their own souls." There never was any saint who would not have concurred with Tertullian when he asks: "Who has paid for the death of another by his own except the Son of God alone? And so you who imitate him by forgiving misdeeds, if you yourself have committed no misdeeds, then suffer on my behalf. But if you are a sinner, how could the oil of your torch have sufficed both for you and for me?" (*On Modesty*, chapter 22). And who would not have joined hands with Augustine when he says: "Even though brothers would die for brothers, yet in the forgiveness of brothers' sins not any martyr's blood is poured out" (*On John*, Treatise 84).

And yet there should be no fear that the saints' sufferings are in vain, for they 46
serve different uses and goals* whereof no doubt can be raised. But they are in vain insofar as their satisfactory powers are concerned, and there is nothing troublesome about the fact that they are without such result if they are not applied to those who need [satisfaction]. For not even the papal teachers deny that the sufferings of all the saints who will still be alive on the Day of the Lord will be in vain. So too for the sufferings that at that time will still be left in the Church's treasury, because then there will not be any people to whom they could be dispensed, unless perhaps the papal teachers think that when purgatory is emptied out there will still be "some days of rest for the guilty spirits under the [river] Styx,"[72] or that these souls will emerge at last by the

72 The verse from Prudentius, *Cathemerinon*, suggests that in hell there are some moments of relief. James Ussher (1581–1656) also refers to this quotation and adds that the pre-Reformation Roman Missal contained a prayer for those who might be in hell, that their souls may feel refreshment in the midst of the torments. See James Ussher, *Archbishop Usher's Answer to a Jesuit: With Other Tracts on Popery* (Cambridge: Deighton, 1835), 211–

vi satisfactionum emersuros, quod delirium aliquos ex iis olim fascinavit, quibus arriserunt suffragia pro defunctis.

XLVII Communicationem vero satisfactionum pro peccatis non requirit *Sanctorum communio*. Nam 1. differt *communio* a communicatione, cum supponat communio rem* aliquam communem, ad quam jus habent aequale illi, inter quos est communio. Non eadem est ratio rei quae communicatur, ab eo cui non est necessaria, alii qui ea indiget. Contra, communio sanctorum, particulares hujus aut illius satisfactiones prorsus evertit; quia quemadmodum in eo consistit communio nostra, ut eundem habeamus Deum, eandem fidem, idem baptisma, eundem Spiritum, non ut Spiritum, fidem, baptisma, nobis superfluum aliis communicemus: sic in eo etiam consistit sanctorum communio, quod omnes jus habent ad unicam Christi satisfactionem. Argumentum igitur a *communione sanctorum*, in adversarios efficaciter retorquetur.

XLVIII Nec firmo magis nititur fundamento,* quod a *communicatione*, quae etiam inter Christianos locum habere debet, desumitur, nam communicatio debet esse eorum bonorum quae communicari possunt,* et ab uno ad alium transire: tales autem esse fidelium passiones, probari* non potest.* Nec ulla ratio* potest afferri, cur *opus bonum qua parte meritorium est, non possit** *aliis applicari*, quod fatetur Bellarm. *De Indulgentiis*, lib. 1. cap. 2.[a] et tamen idem opus, quatenus satisfactorium, possit communicari. Adde, satisfactionem non esse bonum absolutum,* sed relativum* ad eum cui satisfit. Quapropter etiam si talis participatio et communicatio ex parte membrorum, per satisfaciendi intentionem institueretur; non inde sequeretur acceptatio a parte creditoris, sine qua communicationis applicatio prorsus inutilis esset.

XLIX Vanum igitur est quod dicunt, satisfactiones alienas per Praelatos Ecclesiae applicatas, esse *medium*, quo fructus infinitae* satisfactionis Christi, quod attinet ad remissionem poenae, ad homines derivatur; quia non possunt ostendere, tale medium esse a Christo institutum. Praeterea, cum satisfactio Christi *finito modo** *applicetur*, ut revera superaddantur ipsi satisfactiones sanctorum, ut ex Bellarmino ostendimus; satis patet ex ipsorum doctrina, eodem modo applicari satisfactiones sanctorum, quo satisfactiones Christi, quae proinde non sunt applicationes satisfactionis alienae, sed proprie* et per se cum Christi satisfactionibus, in eodem genere considerantur. Mirum autem est, quod vi

[a] Bellarmine, *De indulgentiis* 1.2 (*Opera* 7:19b–20a).

212. The treatise was originally published as James Ussher, *An Answer to a Challenge Made by a Iesuite in Ireland* (Dublin: Societie of Stationers, 1624).

power of the satisfactions—a mad idea that once upon a time fooled some of them who found prayer for the dead appealing.

But the 'communion of the saints' does not require the communication of 47
satisfactions for sin. For 'communion' is different from 'communication,' since communion presupposes some common thing* whereto the people among whom the communion exists have an equal right. The same relationship does not exist for something that the one who does not need it communicates with someone else who does lack it. On the contrary, the communion of saints completely overturns the notion of this or that man's particular satisfactions, because just as our communion consists of the fact that we have the same God, the same faith, the same baptism, and the same Spirit, and not in the fact that we communicate to other people the Spirit, faith or baptism that is superfluous for us, so also the communion of the saints consists in the fact that they all have the right to the one satisfaction of Christ. And so the argument from the 'communion of saints' is effectively turned around against our opponents.

Nor is it a more firm foundation* that supports what they mean by the 48
'communication' that should have its place also among Christians, for the communication ought to be of those goods that can* be communicated and passed from one person to another. But it is impossible* to prove* that the sufferings of believers are goods of this sort. Nor can any reason* be brought forward why "the part of a good work that is meritorious cannot* be applied to others"—a fact that Bellarmine admits (*On Indulgences*, book 1, chapter 2)—whereas the part of the same work that is satisfactory can be communicated. Add to this the fact that satisfaction is not some good in an absolute* sense but relative* to the one to whom satisfaction is made. Therefore even if someone were to establish such participation and communication on the part of the members with the intention to make satisfaction, it does not for that reason follow that there is acceptance on the part of the 'creditor,' without which the application of the communication would be altogether useless.

Therefore the statement they make is false, that another's satisfactions 49
applied by the church's prelates are "means" whereby the fruit of Christ's infinite* satisfaction is drawn down to men insofar as the forgiveness of punishment is concerned, for they cannot show that Christ has instituted this sort of means. Moreover, since Christ's satisfaction "is applied in a limited way"* so that the satisfactions of saints may in fact be added to it (as we have shown from Bellarmine), it is sufficiently clear from their doctrine that the saints' satisfactions are applied in the same way as Christ's satisfactions—and consequently they are not the applications of the satisfaction of another, but are properly* and of themselves considered together with Christ's satisfactions to be of the same kind. The promoters of indulgences want that by the power of

caritatis, qua Ecclesiae membra sunt sibi invicem unita, hoc velint indulgentiarii, ut *quod unus pro altero exsolvit, ita acceptetur pro illo ac si offerretur ab ipsomet*.[a] quod certe fieri non potest sine imputatione alienae justitiae; quam cum extra et contra Script. satisfactionibus hominum concedant, iidem tamen sannis excipiunt doctrinam de imputatione justitiae Christi capitis nostri, ex cujus arctissima conjunctione cum membris omnibus veris, fluit communicatio omnium bonorum, ad aeternam electorum salutem conducentium.

L Ejus solius passiones vim satisfactionis habent, quae ut fidelibus communicentur per imputationem, id sibi tamquam unico redemptori vendicavit. Sed in eo *quod passus pro nobis reliquit nobis exemplum*, 1 Pet. 2, 21. nempe ut pro aliis pateremur, non *per modum* redemptionis, sed per modum exempli et exhortationis, juxta illud*, si tribulamur, pro vestra exhortatione et salute, ait Thom. part. 3. q. 48. art. 5. ad 3.[b] Quo sensu intelligit dictum Apostoli Col. 1, 24. *Gaudeo in passionibus pro vobis et adimpleo τὰ ὑστερήματα, ea quae desunt passionum Christi in carne mea, pro corpore ejus quod est Ecclesia*, vel ut ὑστερήματα sint ea quae unicuique Ecclesiae membro sunt patienda post Christi passionem; quem sensum probavit Gabriel Vasquez Jesuita. *Annot. in Epist. ad Colos*.[c] Sed planiorem existimat, quem in Paraphrasi sequitur hoc modo, *Qui nunc gaudeo, quod tot afflictiones vestri causa patior, quibus quidem in praedicatione Evangelii in me ipso perpessis, impleo quod passioni Christi deerat, ut fructus ejus per laborem praedicationis Evangelicae ad corpus Ecclesiae perveniat, dum ex auditu illius fidem singuli concipientes justificantur*.[d] Non ergo ut inde satisfactio aliqua, per indulgentias conferenda, oriatur.

LI Cum non entis nullae sint affectiones, superfluum esset pluribus agere, *de potestate Ecclesiae in collatione* talium indulgentiarum: num Pontifici tantum

---

[a] Gregory of Valencia, *Commentarii theologici* 4:1849 (7.20.1). [b] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 3.48.5. [c] Gabriel Vázquez, *Paraphrasis et compendiaria Explicatio ad nonnullas Pauli Epistolas* (Ingolstadt: Angermarius, 1613), 250. [d] Gabriel Vázquez, *Paraphrasis*, 248.

love, whereby the members of the church are united with one another, "the payment which one has made on behalf of another would be received in such a way on his behalf as if he himself had offered it." This surely cannot be done without imputing the righteousness of another. And since apart from and against Scripture they grant that imputation to the satisfactions of men, it is surprising that the same people still mockingly accept the doctrine of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ our head, from whose very close union with all his true members the communication of all good things flows forth unto the eternal salvation of the elect.

Only his sufferings have the power to make satisfaction, and as they are 50
communicated to believers by means of imputation, as the only Redeemer he has claimed this for himself. But in "that he has suffered on our behalf and has left us an example" (1 Peter 2:21), namely that we should undergo suffering for the sake of others, "not by the mode* of redemption but through the mode of example and encouragement, according to that" [saying] that if we suffer tribulations it is for your encouragement and salvation, says Thomas (*Summa theologiae* 3, question 48, article 5, point 3). It is in this sense that he understands the apostle's statement: "I rejoice in my sufferings for you and in my flesh I fill up those things that are lacking [*ta hysterēmata*] from Christ's passions for the sake of his body, which is the Church" (Colossians 1:24). Or "what is lacking" are the things that each and every member of the church must suffer following the suffering of Christ; this is the meaning approved by the Jesuit, Gabriel Vasquez (*Annotations* to the Epistle to the Colossians).[73] But he considers the plainer meaning to be the one he pursues as follows in his paraphrase: "I, who now rejoice that I suffer so many afflictions for your sake, by having endured them to the full in myself in the Gospel-preaching fill up what was lacking to Christ's suffering, so that the fruit of it through the labor of the Gospel-preaching might reach the body of the church, when by hearing it everyone might individually receive faith and be justified." Therefore it is not so that thence some satisfaction might come about by the bestowing of indulgences.

Since a nonbeing is not susceptible to any relations,[74] it would be super- 51
fluous to treat further "the church's authority in the collection" of such indulgences: whether the authority is given only to the pope and the bishops "by

73 Gabriel Vásquez (1549–1604), a Spanish Jesuit, was professor of theology in Rome and Alcalá. His most famous work is a commentary on Thomas Aquinas's *Summa*, but he also wrote a paraphrase of and annotations on Paul's epistles.

74 No accidents or relations can be predicated of a non-entity; therefore, having proved that the indulgences have no basis, it is not necessary to go into the details listed in this thesis.

et Episcopis *jure divino*, aliis autem *ex commissione* solum competat; num per absolutionem veram, aut per thesauri dispensationem solam applicentur: num eodem modo* vivis et mortuis; vel vivis *per modum** *absolutionis*, defunctis *per modum suffragii* tantum; num iis tantum qui *sunt in gratia*.* Item, quid *plenaria* sit indulgentia, quid *Carena*, quid *quarentena*, an pro causis parvis, magnae concessae nullae sint prorsus, vel an sint alicujus valoris, quantum talis causa exigit, et quaenam sit ea concedendi causa justa, de quibus inter se litigant indulgentiarum patroni. Neque enim inter eos de valore indulgentiarum, de thesauro, de causae sufficientia, de dispositione recipientis, etc. convenit. Nec diffitentur Magistri Soto et Victoria *diplomata quibus pro minima eleemosyna conceduntur amplissimae indulgentiae intolerabilem errorem continere*, referente Josepho Angles in 4. Sent. diff. 5. art. 2.[a]

LII Non est autem quod quis turbetur, si aliquando in mentionem *indulgentiae* in veterum monumentis incidat; jam enim hoc largitus est Petrus Soto,[b] non habere Pontificios veteris Ecclesiae certa testimonia.* Res* igitur ita se habet. Prisci illi Patres, praesertim in gravibus et publicis delictis, non prius absolvebant et reconciliabant peccatorem, quam longis, asperis et difficilibus exercitiis, Ecclesiae suam poenitentiam probasset.* Sed ingruente persecutione, ut poenitentes ad martyrium alacriores essent, ante tempus aliquando reconciliabantur. ldem fiebat si quis in poenitentia constitutus, in mortis periculo versaretur; vel si fervor contritionis in peccatore talis animadverteretur, ut longiori probatione non esset opus; aut si indiscreta injuncta fuisset poenitentia: talibus per indulgentiam Ecclesiae succurrebatur, ut aliquid de summo illo rigore relaxaretur; quo sensu non solum accipienda sunt Patrum dicta, sed etiam illud

[a] Josephus Angles Valentino, *Flores theologicarum quæstionum, in quartum librum sententiarum* [*Petri Lombardi*], 2 vols. (Antwerp: Petrus Bellerus, 1580–1581), 2:26. The reference to Magister Soto might be to Domingo de Soto, *In quartum sententiarum commentarii*, 2 vols. (Medina del Campo: Franciscus à Canto, 1581), 1:914–920 (21.2.2). The reference to magister Victoria is difficult to trace. [b] Petrus de Soto, *Tractatus de institutione sacerdotum*, 243$^{r–v}$.

divine right" and to others only "by commission." And: whether indulgences are applied through genuine absolution or through a dispensation only from the treasury. Whether indulgences are applied in the same way* to the living as to the dead, or whether to the living "through the mode* of absolution" and to the dead only "through the mode of assistance;" or whether it is given only to those "who are in grace."* And similarly, what is a "plenary" indulgence, a "Carena," a "forty-day" indulgence?[75] And, whether for small causes not any great indulgences at all are granted, or whether they have any such value as the cause demands, and what is a just cause for granting them, concerning which the patrons of indulgences argue with each other. Nor is there any agreement between them about the value of indulgences, about the treasury, the sufficiency of a cause, the disposition of the recipient, etc. And the teachers de Soto and Victoria[76] do not deny that the "certificates whereby the fullest indulgences are bestowed in return for the smallest almsgiving contain an intolerable mistake," as Joseph Angles reports ([*Flowers of Theological Questions*] *on the Sentences*, book 4, [Question regarding Indulgences], article 2, difficulty 5).[77]

Nor should it cause trouble if anyone occasionally stumbles across mention 52
of indulgence in the records of the ancients, for even now Peter de Soto admits that the papal teachers possess no definitive testimony* from the ancient church. The matter,* then, is as follows. Those early fathers, especially in serious, public sins, would not absolve and reconcile the sinner until he had proved* his repentance to the church with long, hard and difficult exercises. But if persecution was about to happen, the penitents would sometimes be absolved beforehand, so that they might go to their martyrdom with greater courage. The same would happen if someone already in the process of penitence found himself in danger of dying, or if such zeal of contrition were observed in the sinner that there was no need for a longer period of testing, or if an accompanying repentance was bound up with it. The church would aid such people by means of indulgences to relax the strictest severity somewhat. Not only the statement of the fathers but also Paul's (which the patrons

75 The indulgences were divided into full and partial indulgences and the latter were subdivided into, for instance, indulgences of forty days (*quadragena*), of a *carena*, the heaviest penitential punishment of seven years; there was discussion about whether these periods referred to the time in purgatory or to the period of penance according to the ecclesial canons.

76 The Dominican Francisco de Vitoria (c. 1483–1546) was a specialist in moral theology and natural law. He founded the School of Salamanca.

77 The most important work of the rather unknown Franciscan theologian José Anglés or Josephus Angles Valentinus (–1588) is his commentary on Peter Lombard's *Sentences*. He does not give references to Peter de Soto or Francisco de Vitoria.

Pauli, quo Indulgentiarii abutuntur, 2. Cor. 2. 10. *Cui condonatis et ego condono: nam et ego, si cui quid condonavi, propter vos id feci in conspectu Christi, nempe, ne redundante tristitia absorberetur*, qui excommunicatus fuerat, v. 7.

LIII Jubilaei institutionem centesimo quoque anno, infamem reddit, non solum impudentissima illa rerum* sacrarum nundinatio, sed etiam ipsius institutoris Bonifacii Octavi (*qui intravit ut vulpes, regnavit ut leo, mortuus est ut canis*) consideratio; qui *aurum undique conquisitum, plusquam dici potest*, teste Platina,[a] *sitiebat*. Quem eodem percitus oestro, secutus est Clemens VI. qui (*dubium an amore pecuniae, an desiderio salutis hominum*) *sancivit eum celebrari anno quinquagesimo*. Quem postea Sixtus V. cujus ambitio et vafrities omnibus nota est, ad vigesimum quintum quemque annum reduxit; *quem vocat annum placabilem, annum remissionis et veniae, tempus acceptabile, et diem aeternum salutis*, Clemens VIII. in bulla suae indictionis, vere quidem bulla; cui nos opponimus

[a] Bartholomaeus Platina, *Historia de vitis pontificum romanorum* (Cologne: Maternus Cholinus, 1574), 221.

of indulgences misuse) should be taken in this way: "Anyone whom you forgive I also forgive, for also I, if I have forgiven anything, did so for your sake in the presence of Christ" (2 Corinthians 2:10), namely, "so that the man who had been excommunicated should not be overwhelmed by overflowing grief" (verse 7).

What rendered the institution of the hundred-year Jubilee disreputable 53
was that most shameless business-dealing in sacred matters* as well as the consideration of its very founder, Boniface the Eighth[78] (who "took office as a fox, ruled like a lion, and died like a dog"), as he used to thirst for "gold obtained from any place at all, more than one could say," as Platina[79] attests. Driven by the same mad lust, Clement the Sixth[80] followed in his footsteps and he "(it is doubtful whether by a lust for money or a desire for men's salvation) gave the sanction that the Jubilee should be celebrated every fifty years." And later, Sixtus the Fifth,[81] whose ambition and cunning was known to all, reduced it to every twenty-five years. Clement the Eighth[82] calls [the Jubilee] "the Lord's year of appeasement, the year of forgiveness and pardon, the acceptable time, and the day of eternal salvation" in the announcement-bull (which really was a boil!). Over against him we put forward the sure certificate of the Christian

78 Boniface VIII (c. 1230–1303) became pope in 1294 after his predecessor Celestine V had resigned under his pressure. In 1300 he proclaimed the first Roman Catholic jubilee year in which he granted plenary indulgences to the pilgrims to Rome. He had a lasting conflict with the French king Philip IV whom he excommunicated after he had accused the pope of the death of Celestine V. The quote is also mentioned by Philips of Marnix, Lord of Saint-Aldegonde, who in his *Roman Bee-hive* refers to the *World Chronicle* (1516) of Johannes Nauclerus. See Philips of Marnix, *De bijen-korf der H. Roomsche Kerk*, ed. Johannes Justus van Toorenenbergen (Groningen: Schierbeek, 1862), 1:297.

79 Pope Sixtus IV ordered the papal writer, Bartolomeo Sacchi, also known as Platina (1421–1481), to write a history of the lives of the popes, the first systematic handbook of papal history.

80 Clement VI (1291–1352) became pope in 1342; he was the fourth pope who seated in Avignon and he had strong French sympathies. In the bull *Unigenitus Dei filius* (1343) he confirmed the power of the pope to dispense indulgences for the remission of sins from the treasury of the merits of Christ and the saints. He reduced the jubilee term to fifty years.

81 Sixtus V (1521–1590) became pope in 1585 and started his reign with an extraordinary jubilee year, also announcing one in in 1590. The reference, however, is probably to Sixtus IV (1414–1484), who became pope in 1471 and announced that every 25 years there would be a jubilee so that every generation would have the chance to experience at least one holy year. As a Renaissance pope he was notorious for his love of art of which the Sistine Chapel is the most famous example.

82 Clement VIII (1536–1605), became pope in 1592. The reference is to his announcement of the jubilee of 1600, the most recent one at the time when this disputation was defended.

diploma certum Jubilaei Christiani, Jes. 61. 2. Luc. 4, 19. *Dominus misit me, ut praedicarem annum beneplaciti Jehovae*, nempe laetissimum Evangelii praeconium, ex sinu aeterni Patris allatum, in quo gratis, omnibus credentibus, vere poenitentibus, annunciatur liberatio ab omnibus peccatis et peccatorum poenis, quocunque tempore et loco.

LIV Eo autem nomine gratias Deo debemus maximas, quod Patrum nostrorum memoria, cum permisisset nundinationem indulgentiarum ad extremum impudentiae culmen conscendere, Leone decimo publicum forum per omnia mundi regna aperiente, ea occasione suscitavit Martinum Lutherum, qui cum initio nihil aliud cogitaret, quam immoderatos abusus taxare, sensim, Deo sic providente, et adversariorum protervia materiam administrante, deductus est non solum ad totius structurae indulgentiarum, ab ipsis fundamentis* eversionem; sed inde etiam, cum adversarii ad locos communes auctoritatis Pontificiae et similes confugerent, eos persequendo, tandem digressus est ad ipsius Pontificis usurpatam potestatem convellendam; donec paulatim per ejus ministerium, opus illud admirandum reformationis verae doctrinae, per eundem et alios promovit, quod postquam maximo Dei beneficio nostris temporibus longe lateque propagatum est, superest, ut cognito vero fonte remissionis peccatorum, deinceps in eo loti, a peccatis abstineamus, et Deum Patrem, in Christo Filio, per Spiritum Sanctum in aeternum glorificemus.

COROLLARIA.

I Limbum puerorum, *ad quem Pontificii ablegant animas infantium, qui sine externa baptismi lotione ex hac vita decesserunt, aliquo Scripturae aut primaevae antiquitatis fundamento* inniti, negamus*.

II *Aliquos post hanc vitam in inferis plecti poena* damni, *qui ab omni* sensus *poena sint exempti, commentum esse a veritate et a ratione* alienum affirmamus*.

III *Patriarchas et omnes Sanctos sub Veteri Testamento, in inferno detentos fuisse, spiritus Marcionitici inventum esse*, testatur Tertull. lib. 4. *Contra Marcionem* cap. 34.[a] Utramque nempe mercedem, sive tormenti, sive refrigerii, apud inferos determinantis, eis positam qui legi et Prophetis obedierunt.

[a] Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* 4.34.11 (SC *456:422*).

Jubilee (Isaiah 61:2; Luke 4:19): "The Lord has sent me to proclaim the acceptable year of Jehovah," namely the most joyful preaching of the Gospel brought from the bosom of the eternal Father, in which is announced to all believers, the real penitents, the liberation from all sins and all penalties for sins, in every time and place.

And for that reason we should give our utmost thanks to God because in 54
the time of our forebears, when He had allowed the business-dealing of indulgences to reach the acme of shamelessness when Leo the Tenth[83] opened public market-squares throughout all the kingdoms of the world, He raised up Martin Luther, who at first was thinking of nothing else than to punish the unlimited abuses, gradually, in God's providence and by his enemies recklessly providing a cause, was led not merely to overturn the entire system of indulgences from its very foundations,* but thence also, when his enemies took refuge in those commonplaces of proof for the pope's authority (and the like), by pursuing them was finally led to the point of tearing down usurped power of the pope himself, until little by little through his ministry that marvelous work of the reformation of true doctrine was promoted through him and others, which afterward in God's greatest goodwill was spread far and wide during our own times. Thus it remains that we, acknowledging the true source of the forgiveness of sins, and then being washed in it, should abstain from sins, and bring glory to God the Father, in Christ the Son, and through the Holy Spirit forever.

Corollary

1. We declare that the *Limbo of children*, whereto the papal teachers send the souls of infants who have departed from this life without the outward washing of baptism, does not rest upon any basis* in Scripture or earliest antiquity.
2. We state that it is an invention alien to the truth and to reason* that some people after this life are punished in hell by the punishment of damnation but are exempt from the total punishment of the senses.[84]
3. It is an invention from a spirit of Marcionism that the patriarchs and all the saints of the Old Testament were detained in the world below, as Tertullian testifies (*Against Marcion*, book 4, chapter 34): "Both conditions, whether of the torment or of the relief which determines their state in the underworld, are laid upon those who were obedient to the law and the prophets."[85]

---

83 Leo X (1475–1521) was pope from 1513 and became famous for the conflict with Martin Luther about indulgences and for Luther's excommunication.

84 For the distinction see thesis 33 above and note 59.

85 This is a quote from Marcion that Tertullian rejects.

DISPUTATIO XL

De Ecclesia[a]

Praeside D. ANTONIO WALAEO[b]
Respondente JACOBO BOSSCHAERT

THESIS I Ecclesiae vox* est Graeca, ἀπο τοῦ ἐκκαλεῖν, id est, evocare, respondens voci Hebraicae קהל et עדה et proprie* coetum seu conventum hominum significat* a superiore aliquo convocatum, non tantum in usum ac finem* sacrum, sed etiam profanum et politicum, ut videre est Act. 19, 32. 39.

II Nos vero hic vocem* Ecclesiae sumimus, pro coetu vel conventu sacro, prout inter Christianos receptum. Sumitur quidem aliquando ab iisdem pro loco, in quo conventus sacri habentur, sed hujus significationis exempla in Scripturis non exstant.

III Definitur generali sua notione, coetus eorum, quos Deus per gratiam* suam evocat e statu naturae,* in statum supernaturalem* filiorum Dei ad demonstrationem gloriosae misericordiae suae.

IV Deum esse hujus Vocationis auctorem primarium, extra controversiam est in Ecclesia Christi; ut qui solus potest* donare gratiam ad quam vocat, et ordinare media, per quae haec vocatio est instituenda, sicuti Apostolus loquitur Hebr. 3, 4. *Omnis domus ab aliquo constituitur, porro qui condidit omnia haec*, loquens de Ecclesia Christi, *est Deus*.

V Materia seu objectum hujus Vocationis, sunt solae creaturae ad imaginem Dei conditae, nempe Angeli et homines. Nam licet Deus ex lapidibus possit facere filios Abrahae, ut Christus loquitur Matth. 3, 9. tamen creaturae[c] ad imaginem Dei conditae, beatae immortalitatis ac coelestis felicitatis per se ac proxime tantum capaces sunt.

VI De Angelorum quorundam evocatione ex statu mutabilis naturae,* ad statum immutabilem* gloriosae gratiae, pauca nobis in Scripturis revelata sunt. Quia tamen peculiariter Dei filii passim vocantur, et Angeli lucis, et Angeli

---

[a] The original disputation was published as Antonius Walaeus, *Disputationum theologicarum quadragesima, de ecclesia*, resp. Jacobus Bosschaert (Leiden: Isaac Elzevir, 1623) and was dated June 24, 1623. The copy that was used from the Library of Trinity College in Dublin contains only the first 18 theses. [b] Walaeus's *Loci communes* offer an elaborate discussion of the Church in chapter XIX "De Ecclesia" containing the paragraphs "De Purgatorio," "De Ecclesia triumphante," "De Ecclesia militante," and "De Ecclesiae Notis" (*Opera* 1:444–465). [c] solae creaturae: original disputation.

DISPUTATION 40

On the Church

President: Antonius Walaeus
Respondent: Jacobus Bosschaert[1]

'Ecclesia' is a Greek word* that comes from *ekkalein*, which is 'to call out,' and it corresponds to the Hebrew words *qahal* and *'edah*, and strictly* speaking means* a meeting or gathering of people who have been called by some higher authority, not solely for a purpose or end* that is sacred, but also for non-religious and political ones, as can be seen in Acts 19:32 and 39. 1

But we here take the word* 'Ecclesia' in the sense of a meeting or gathering that is sacred, as Christians commonly understand it. Occasionally they use it for the place where they hold sacred gatherings, but examples of this meaning do not occur in Scripture. 2

In general the meaning of the word is defined as the meeting of those whom God in his grace* calls out from the state of nature* into the supernatural* state of children of God, in order to show his glorious mercy.[2] 3

In the Church of Christ it is beyond dispute that God is the primary author of this calling, since He alone can* bestow the grace to which He calls, and ordain the means whereby this calling is to be made, just as the apostle says in Hebrews 3:4: "For every house is built by someone, but the one who has built all these"—and he is speaking about the Church of Christ—"is God." 4

The subject-matter, or object of this calling are only the creatures who have been made in the image of God, that is, angels and men. For although God is able to make sons of Abraham from stones, as Christ says in Matthew 3:9, yet only creatures made in the image of God are of themselves and directly capable of receiving blessed immortality and heavenly happiness. 5

Only a few things are revealed to us in the Scriptures about the calling of some angels from the state of mutable nature* to the immutable* state of glorious grace. Nevertheless, because everywhere they are specifically called 6

1 Born c. 1599 in Oud-Vossemeer, Jacobus Bosschaert matriculated on October 21, 1619 in theology. He defended this disputation on 24 June 1623. He was ordained in Sint-Annaland in 1626 and Goes 1630; he died in 1643. See Du Rieu, *Album studiosorum*, 143 and Van Lieburg, *Repertorium*, 31.

2 The theses 1–7 closely follow the text of the opening theses on "The Church" in Walaeus's *Loci*, where he, for instance, defines the Church as "as the meeting of those whom God in his grace calls out from nature into the supernatural state of children of God, to his glory" (*Opera* 1:444).

gloriae, et Angeli electi, atque ipsum Christum peculiare quoque caput agnoscunt, Eph. 1, 22. et ipsi se conservos nostros appellant, et conservos fratrum, imo et ex fratribus qui habent testimonium* Jesu, Apoc. 19, 10., consequens est, ut eos esse membra totius illius corporis, et in familia Christi nostros conservos confiteamur: ac proinde per Spiritus Sancti peculiarem operationem sub Christo unico Ecclesiae suae capite efficaciter in gloria et gratia confirmatos. Unde et nos ad Myriadas Angelorum, per efficacem vocationem, accessisse, declarat Apostolus Hebr. 12, 22.

VII Etsi vero hoc Angelorum consortium nobis gloriae sit et consolationi, praecipue tamen de Ecclesia hominum nobis est agendum, quia id maxime nostra interest. De qua 1. partes sunt examinandae, earumque modus* et forma, 2. divisio, ac denique privilegia ac notae.

VIII Partes hujus Ecclesiae ὅλως consideratae statuunt, Pontificii tres, nempe unam laborantem in purgatorio, alteram triumphantem in coelo, et tertiam militantem in terra. Duas posteriores partes nos libenter agnoscimus, tertiam ab iis esse extra Dei Verbum* confictam, ad crumenas expurgandas et animos hominum δεισιδαιμονεστέρων spirituali servitute premendas, antecedenti disputatione satis est ostensum; ac proinde de duabus reliquis in sequentibus nobis tantum agendum.

IX Ecclesiae universalis magnam partem, in coelis sub Christo capite suo triumphare, adversus Socinianos, Anabaptistas, Libertinos, et similes haereticos, omnes loci evincunt, ex quibus animae immortalitas evincitur. Nam etsi *corpus*

the sons of God, angels of light, angels of glory, and elect angels, and because they also recognize Christ himself as their special head (Ephesians 1:22), and because they call themselves our fellow servants, fellow-servants of the brothers, and even belonging to the brothers who have the testimony* of Jesus (Revelation 19:10), it follows that we should profess that they are members of that entire body, and our fellow-servants in the family of Christ. And consequently through the particular working of the Holy Spirit under Christ the one and only Head of his Church, they are effectively established in glory and grace. Therefore the apostle declares that we, too, have come to the myriads of angels through the effective calling (Hebrews 12:22).

Yet even though this fellowship with angels is a source of glory and comfort 7
to us, still we should give special treatment to the Church of human beings because that is of the greatest interest to us. And about that Church we must investigate: the parts of the Church and their mode* and form, the division of the Church, and finally the privileges and marks of the Church.

When the parts of the Church are considered as a whole, the papal teachers 8
determine three parts for it, i.e., one that is laboring in purgatory, the second that is triumphant in heaven, and the third that is militant here on earth.[3] We recognize with pleasure the two latter parts of the Church; but in a prior disputation we have demonstrated sufficiently that their third one is from outside of God's Word* and invented,[4] for the sake of emptying out money-supplies and oppressing the souls of god-fearing people with spiritual slavery.[5] And so in what follows we need only to treat the other two parts.

All the places that show convincingly the immortality of the soul prove over- 9
against the Socinians, Anabaptists, Libertines, and similar heretics that a large part of the universal Church is triumphant in heaven under Christ its head.[6] For

3 The twofold division of the Church into 'triumphant in heaven' and 'militant on earth' goes back to Augustine, though he does not use the exact terms. It seems that Peter Comestor (died c. 1178) introduced the term 'militant Church.' See Christine Thouzellier, "Ecclesia militans," in *Études d'histoire du droit canonique dédiées à Gabriel le Bras*, 2 vols. (Paris: Sirey, 1965), 2:1407–1424. The idea of purgatory as a distinct place was developed in the twelfth century. This led to a threefold division of the Church, which is mentioned already by Pope Innocent III (1198–1216); cf. Jacques Le Goff, *The Birth of Purgatory*, tr. Arthur Goldhammer (London: Scholar Press, 1990), 174–175. The Church in purgatory was also called the 'sleeping,' 'expectant,' 'penitent' or 'suffering' Church.

4 See disputation 39, especially *SPT* 39.6–16.

5 The Greek comparative *daisidaimonesteros* is used in Acts 17:22 for the superstitious worship of the people of Athens.

6 The groups Walaeus mentions endorsed a view that is labelled 'psychopannechism,' after death the soul is asleep, or even dead. Calvin's earliest theological work, *Psychopannychia*

redeat in terram quemadmodum fuerat, tamen spiritus redit ad Deum qui dedit illum, Eccl. 12, 7. Et licet sint *qui corpus piorum possint occidere, animam tamen eorum occidere non possunt*, ut Christus testatur, Matt. 10, 28.

x Imprimis tamen id liquet ex iis locis et exemplis, in quibus defunctorum felicitas et beatitudo describitur. Ut videmus Matt. 20. 8. ubi omnes *laborantes in vinea* peracto labore *accipiunt mercedem suam*, et 2 Cor. 5, 1. *Scimus quod si terrestris domus hujus tabernaculi fuerit soluta, habeamus aliud domicilium aeternum, et non manufactum in coelis*, et Apoc. 14, 13. *Beati mortui qui in Domino moriuntur,* ἀπάρτι, *ab hoc tempore, requiescunt a laboribus suis, et opera eorum sequuntur eos*.

xi Nec vero fideles tantum in Novo Testamento post ascensum Christi in coelos, sed et ipsos fideles sub Veteri Testamento in fide defunctos, ad hanc Ecclesiae in coelo triumphantis partem pertinuisse, tenendum est adversus Pontificios, qui eos in limbo subterraneo conclusos fuisse, atque inde adventum Domini exspectasse sentiunt.

xii Demonstrant* illud Christi promissiones, demonstrant* alii loci Scripturae, demonstrant* clarissima exempla.

xiii Promissiones manifestae sunt, Ps. 16, 11. *Satietas gaudiorum in conspectu tuo amoenissimorum, dextera tua in aeternitatem.* Matt. 5, 3. *Beati pauperes spiritu, quia ipsorum est regnum coelorum*, et v. 8. *Beati mundo corde, quia ipsum Deum videbunt*, et v. 10. *Beati qui persecutionem passi sunt* δεδιωγμένοι, *quia ipsorum est regnum coelorum. Gaudete et exultate quia merces vestra est multa in coelis; sic enim persecuti sunt Prophetas*, etc. Haec dicta Christi sine dubio jam tum vera fuerunt, cum ea pronunciavit, non tum demum vera evaserunt, cum Christus a mortuis resurrexit et ad coelos ascendit.

(1534), was directed against this doctrine. The Council of Florence (1439) decided that the souls of the just enjoy the beatific vision immediately after death; see *SPT* 39.33, note 52. On the revival of the concept of 'soul sleep' among Aristotelian humanists in Italy in the fifteenth century see Williams, *Radical Reformation*, 64–70.

while "the body returns to the earth from where it came, yet the spirit returns to God who has given it" (Ecclesiastes 12:7). And although "there are those who can kill the bodies of the pious, yet they cannot kill their souls," as Christ testifies in Matthew 10:28.

But this is clear especially from those places and instances that depict the 10
happiness and blessed state of the deceased. As we see in Matthew 20:8, where "all who labored in the vineyard, when their labor has been completed, receive their reward," in 2 Corinthians 5:1: "We know that if the earthly dwelling-place is broken down, we have another, eternal home in heaven not made with hands," and in Revelation 14:13: "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord, from this time forth (*ap' arti*) they rest from their labors, and their works follow them."

But contrary to the papal teachers we must maintain that not only believers 11
under the New Testament, after Christ's ascension into heaven, but also believers who died in the faith under the Old Testament, reached this part of the triumphant Church in heaven. They, on the other hand, think that those people had been locked up in a subterranean limbo and from there they have been looking for the coming of the Lord.[7]

The promises of Christ demonstrate* this, as do other places in Scripture, 12
and also very clear exemplary instances.

The promises are clear: "There is fullness of joys most pleasant in your 13
presence, at your right hand forevermore" (Psalm 16:11). "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven" (Matthew 5:3), and "Blessed are the pure of heart, for they shall see God" (verse 8). "Blessed are those who suffer persecution (*dediōgmenoi*), for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Rejoice and be glad, because great is your reward in heaven; for thus they persecuted the prophets, etc." (verse 10). Without a doubt these sayings of Christ were true already then when he declared them, and did not become true only when Christ rose from the dead and ascended into heaven.[8]

---

7 Walaeus refers to the doctrine of the 'Limbo of the fathers,' that part of the underworld in which the souls of the just fathers of the Old Testament awaited their release by Christ. It was identified with the 'bosom of Abraham.' The doctrine was developed in the twelfth century. See Le Goff, *Birth of Purgatory*, 134–135. The idea was that these souls were freed when Christ descended into hell after his death. Thomas Aquinas argued that Christ 'applies' the universal significance of his historical passion to the just individuals of the past, 'the fathers,' through the descent into hell, and to the individual persons of the future through the sacraments; see also *Summa theologiae* 3.52.1.2. For the rejection of the 'Limbo of the fathers' see *SPT* 27.26, note 29, and 28.18.

8 Most medieval theologians, like Aquinas, linked the reception of the beatific vision by the saints who had died before Christ, to Christ's descent into hell, not to his ascension into heaven; see previous note.

XIV Loci Scripturae qui statum piorum defunctorum ante Christi passionem declarant, non minus manifesti sunt; quales sunt, Eph. 1, 10. *Deus recollegit omnia in Christo tum quae in coelis sunt, tum quae in terra*, et Col. 1, 20. *Per Christum reconciliata sunt omnia tum quae in terra, tum quae in coelis*. Per quem loquendi modum cum Angeli intelligi non possint, qui per Christum Deo reconciliati non sunt, consequens est ut de Sanctis ante Christum in coelo agentibus, id intelligatur; sicuti Apostolus Hebr. 12, 22. ideo nos sub Novo Testamento dicit *accessisse ad montem Sion et civitatem Dei vivi, Hierusalem coelestem*, etc. *et conventum ac concionem primogenitorum, qui conscripti sunt in coelis*.

XV Exempla ejus rei illustria nobis quoque in Scriptura proponuntur, Elias, 2 Reg. 2, 11. expresse dicitur translatus in coelum sicuti idem confirmatur,[a] 1 Macch. 2, 58. Moses et Elias comparuerunt in monte coram Christo, ac discipulis tribus in gloria, et deinde per nubem ab eorum oculis subducti sunt, Luc. 9, 31. Ex qua nube vox descendit, *Hic est Filius meus*, etc. Quam e coelo descendisse testatur Petrus, 2 Pet. 1, 18. Lazarus ab Angelis translatus fuit in sinum Abrahae. Angelos autem ad subterranea loca fideles deferre nunquam dicit Scriptura, cum ipsorum proprium domicilium sit coelum; et Matt. 8, 11. expresse dicitur, quod hic sinus Abrahae, in quo accumbunt fideles, sit coelum: *Dico vobis*, inquit Christus, *quod ab Oriente et Occidente venient et accumbent cum Abrahamo, Isaaco, et Jacobo in regno coelorum*. Idem denique confirmat exemplum latronis cum Christo crucifixi, cui Christus promittit quod eodem die cum ipso sit[b] futurus in paradiso, Luc. 23, 43. Paradisum autem esse tertium coelum, asserit Apostolus, 2 Cor. 12, 2. 4.

XVI Ex quibus apparet, Patres non minus ante Christi adventum in coelis virtute Christi venturi triumphasse, quam in Novo Testamento jam regnant virtute Christi passi et in coelum recepti.

XVII Imo vero asserimus ex Scriptura, pios defunctos sub utroque Testamento non tantum gaudio aliquo coelesti extra Dei conspectum frui, ut quidam viri magni putarunt, sed in ipso Dei conspectu vera et solida beatitudine perfrui;

---

[a] confirmatur ex recepta Judaeorum sententia: 1642. [b] esset: 1642.

14 The passages from Scripture which reveal the state of the pious who have died before Christ's suffering are no less clear. Such passages include Ephesians 1:10: "God unites all things both in heaven and on earth in Christ," and Colossians 1:20: "And through Christ all things were reconciled, both in heaven and on earth." Since this manner of speaking cannot mean those angels who were not reconciled to God through Christ, it follows that it must mean the saints dwelling in heaven before [the advent of] Christ, just as the apostle says in Hebrews 12:22 that so we "have come to Mount Zion and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem," etc., and "to the meeting and assembly of the first-born who are enrolled in heaven."

15 Scripture also presents to us brilliant examples of this state: Elijah (2 Kings 2:11) is said expressly to have been carried into heaven, and 1 Maccabees 2:58 confirms it.[9] Moses and Elijah appeared on the mountain in the company of Christ and three disciples, in glory; and then they were taken away from before their eyes by a cloud (Luke 9:31). And from that cloud a voice came down: "This is my Son, etc." And Peter testifies to the fact that this voice came down from heaven (2 Peter 1:18). The angels carried Lazarus into the bosom of Abraham. But the Scriptures say nowhere that the angels carried believers to places under the earth, since their proper dwelling is in heaven. Matthew 8:11 states explicitly that this bosom of Abraham, wherein the faithful recline, is heaven. Christ says: "I say to you that they will come from East and West and recline with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven." And lastly, the same is confirmed by the example of the thief who was crucified together with Christ, whom Christ promised that on the same day he would be with him in Paradise (Luke 23:43). The apostle asserts that Paradise is the third heaven (2 Corinthians 12:2 and 4).

16 From these passages it is clear that before Christ's coming the fathers were no less triumphant in heaven by the power of the coming Christ than under the New Testament now that they are reigning by the power of Christ after he suffered and was taken up into heaven.

17 In fact we assert from Scripture that the pious who have died under either of both testaments are not just enjoying some heavenly joy apart from the presence of God, as some of the great men used to think, but that they are fully enjoying true and unbroken blessedness in God's very presence.[10] Even so we

9 The appeal to an apocryphal book is nuanced in 1642: "And the accepted interpretation of the Jews confirms it (1 Maccabees 2:58)."

10 Many church fathers thought that the righteous who have died have to wait till the end of times before entering heaven and enjoying the beatific vision; see *SPT* 39.33. But most agreed that even before the general resurrection, the souls of the just are in a happier state

etsi non negemus, quin aliquis felicitatis gradus iis ad extremum diem, quando cum corporibus suis conjungentur, reservetur.

XVIII Id demonstrant* plurimi Scripturae loci, nam et David veram eorum beatudinem in Dei conspectu collocat, Ps. 16, 23. et 84. Et Paulus optat dissolvi et esse cum Christo, Phil. 1, 23. et 2 Cor. 5, 8. *Ideo probamus potius migrari e corpore, et ire ad Dominum habitatum*. Christum autem esse apud Patrem et in throno Patris, testatur Apostolus, Apoc. 3, 21. Joh. 17, 5. Hebr. 9, 24. Unde et in Apocalypsi passim Sancti defuncti una cum Angelis ante thronum Dei et Agni constituuntur, ut ei perpetuas laudes et gratiarum actiones accinant, sicut videre est Apoc. 4, 8. et 5, 8. et 7, 9.

XIX Nec tamen inde sequitur, hanc partem Ecclesiae triumphantis ea ratione praefectam esse militanti in terris, sicuti Pontificii somniant, qui eos Regnis, Provinciis, urbibus et pagis, imo morbis, artibus, paci et bello, tamquam Divos tutelares praeficiunt. Etsi enim S. Scriptura ministerium aliquod commune* in his rebus* Angelis assignet, de Sanctis tamen defunctis universe testatur, quod *ingrediuntur pacem et requiescunt a laboribus suis*, Esa. 57, 2. Apoc. 14, 13. *et quod non ascendunt neque revertuntur ultra in domum suam, neque agnoscet eos amplius locus eorum*, Hiob. 7, 10. *imo si augescant liberi, id ignorant, si minuantur, non attendunt*, Hiob. 14, 21. Item *nos ad illos imus, sed illi ad nos non revertuntur*, 2 Sam. 12, 23. *et non vident totum illud malum, quod Deus inducit in populum suum*, 2 Reg. 22, 20.

XX Et vero cum natura* ipsorum pugnat, ut sint simul ac curent diversis ac dissitis in locis; sicuti eundem Sanctum diversis locis ac dissitissimis praefectum volunt. S. puta Jacobum Hispanis, degentibus in Europa, India et America. S. Dominicum, Franciscum, etc. omnibus eorum coenobiis toto orbe dispersis. Beatam vero Virginem coeli reginam, terrae Dominam, ac maris Stellam, (etsi inepte pro maris stilla) vocitant, etc. cum soli Deo conveniat *e coelis intueri ac*

---

than those of the wicked. See, e.g., Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho* 5 and Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* II.34.1 and V.31.2.

do not deny that some degree of happiness is kept aside for them until the last day, when [their souls] will be joined to their bodies.[11]

This is demonstrated* by very many places of Scripture, for also David 18
locates the place of their true blessedness as the presence of God (Psalm 16, 23 and 84). And Paul desires "to depart and to be with Christ" (Philippians 1:23); and 2 Corinthians 5:8: "And so we choose rather to depart from the body and go to dwell with the Lord." The apostle testifies that Christ is with the Father, and on the Father's throne (Revelation 3:21; John 17:5; Hebrews 9:24). Therefore also throughout Revelation the deceased saints are placed together with the angels before the throne of God and the Lamb, so that they sing constant praises and give thanks to Him, as can be seen in Revelation 4:8, 5:8, and 7:9.

However, it does not therefore follow that this part of the Church that is 19
triumphant is therefore put in charge of the militant Church on earth, as in the dream of those papal teachers who put them in charge of kingdoms, provinces, cities and districts—even diseases, the arts, peace and war—like patron deities.[12] For even if Holy Scripture does assign the angels some common* ministry in these matters,* it testifies everywhere that the deceased saints "enter into peace and rest from their labors" (Isaiah 57:2; Revelation 14:13), "and that they do not arise or return again to their own home, nor does their place know them any more" (Job 7:10); "in fact, if their children increase, they are unaware of it, and if they are brought low, they do not perceive it" (Job 14:21). Likewise "we shall go to them but they will not return to us" (2 Samuel 12:23), and "they do not see all the evil that God brings upon his people" (2 Kings 22:20).

And in fact it contradicts the nature* of deceased saints that they should be 20
present in and care for diverse and widely scattered places at one and the same time, as when the [papal teachers] want to put one and the same saint in charge of diverse and widely scattered places. Think of Saint James for the Spanish, who dwell in Europe, India, and America. Or Saints Dominic and Francis, etc., for all their monasteries spread across the whole globe. Or even the blessed Virgin, whom they call Queen of Heaven, Mistress of the Earth, and Star of the Sea (*Stella Maris*)—even though this is a wrong rendering of Drop of the Sea (*Stilla maris*)[13]—since it is fitting only for God to "look down from the heavens

11 The properties of the resurrected bodies of the saints will be discussed later, especially in *SPT* 51.25–26 and 52.28–32.

12 Walaeus refers to the common Roman Catholic custom of dedicating countries, cities, churches, professional groups etc., to patron saints and of invoking particular saints in case of diseases, dangers, etc.

13 In his explanation of Hebrew names, Jerome derived the Hebrew name 'Miriam' (latinized as Maria) from the Hebrew words *mar* (drop) and *yam* (sea). The Latin word for 'drop' is *stilla*. According to Pelikan, Isidore of Seville (c. 560–636) changed *stilla* into *stella* (star);

videre omnes filios hominum, e loco habitationis suae prospicere in omnes habitatores terrae, Psalm 33, 13. 14.

XXI Quapropter ea quae Matt. 24, 47. de praefectura fidelis servi super omnia Domini bona dicuntur, de spiritualibus bonis intelligenda sunt, ut Rom. 8, 17. *dicimur haeredes Dei et cohaeredes Christi.* Item quae de rectione gentium in virga ferrea et sessione in throno Dei dicuntur, Apoc. 2. et 3. necessario allegorice intelligenda sunt, de plena gloria et dominio adversus Satanam, mundum et carnem; ut Paulus exponit, 1Cor. 15, 56. et Johannes, Apoc. 5, 10. et 21, 7.

XXII Explicatis iis breviter quae partem illam Ecclesiae quae in coelis triumphat, concernunt, descendamus ad illam Ecclesiae partem, quae adversus carnem, mundum et Satanam adhuc pugnat seu militat, quemadmodum Paulus loquitur, Gal. 5, 17. 1Joh. 5, 4. Eph. 6, 12.

XXIII Ecclesiam semper aliquam in terris fuisse, et usque ad finem mundi futuram, evincunt promissiones plurimae de ejus perseveratione, quales exstant Jerem. 31, 36. Matt. 16, 18. Matt. 28, 20. etc. Evincit officium Christi qui aeternus est Rex, Sponsus, Pastor, ac caput Ecclesiae suae, qui sine regno, sponsa, grege, et corpore quod hic vivificat, esse non potest.* Evincit denique officium omnium salvandorum, quia nemo potest Deum habere pro Patre, qui non habet Ecclesiam pro Matre, ut Paulus testatur, Galat. 4, 26.

XXIV Nec vero sufficit quemadmodum Libertini contendunt, ut membra hujus Christi Ecclesiae singula separatim spiritualem cum ignota Ecclesia communionem dicant se colere, etiamsi extrinsecus vel nullam cum ullo coetu communionem colant, vel etiam cum coetibus idololatricis et apostaticis communionem se colere simulent. Sed ad veram Ecclesiam consituendam, asse-

---

see Jaroslav Pelikan, *Mary through the Centuries: Her Place in the History of Culture* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 94.

and behold all the sons of men, and from his dwelling-place to look forth upon all the inhabitants of the earth" (Psalm 33:13–14).

21 And therefore what Matthew 24:47 says about the faithful servant's command over all his master's goods should be understood as being about spiritual goods, as in Romans 8:17: "We are called heirs of God and fellow-heirs with Christ." And also what Revelation 2 and 3 say about ruling over the nations with an iron rod, and being seated on God's throne should necessarily be understood allegorically, about the complete glory and dominion over Satan, the world, and the flesh,[14] as Paul explains in 1 Corinthians 15:56 and John in Revelation 5:10 and 21:7.

22 Having explained briefly the things concerning that part of the Church that is triumphant in heaven, let us go down to that part of the Church which is still fighting or battling against the flesh, the world and Satan, as Paul says in Galatians 5:17; 1 John 5:4, and Ephesians 6:12.

23 The very many promises found in Jeremiah 31:36, Matthew 16:18, Matthew 28:20, etc., about the preservation of the Church, show clearly that there always has been a Church on earth, and that there shall be one until the end of the world. The office of Christ clearly shows this, as he is the eternal King, Bridegroom, Shepherd, and Head of this Church, which he cannot* be if there is no kingdom, bride, flock, and body that he makes alive here on earth. And finally, it is shown clearly by the office of all those who will be saved, because no-one can have God for a Father who does not have the Church for a mother, as Paul testifies (Galatians 4:26).[15]

24 But what the Libertines claim is not enough, that individual members of the Church of Christ say that they separately foster spiritual communion with the unknown church, even if they do not foster any outward communion at all with any meeting, or even if they pretend to foster a communion with idolatrous and apostate meetings.[16] But we assert that in order to establish

14 The concept of the threefold enemy—the flesh, the world and the devil—of the Church militant goes back to medieval explanations of the sixth petition of the Lord's Prayer. See, for instance Peter Abelard, *Expositio Orationis Dominicae* in *Opera hactenus seorsim edita* (Paris: Durand, 1849–1859), 1:602.

15 The exact statement "You cannot have God for your Father if you do not have the Church for your mother" is from Cyprian of Carthage, *The Unity of the Catholic Church* 6. It was quoted by Calvin in his *Institutes* 4.1.1.

16 The 'Libertines' are difficult to pinpoint; see also *SPT* 2.8 and 28.3. Here Walaeus has in mind the proponents of a spiritualism who had little interest in the visible Church. In his *Loci* he mentions Dirck Volckertsz Coornhert (1522–1590) as a representative (*Opera* 1:454); other names associated with this movement in the Netherlands include David Joris (1501–1556), and Caspar Coolhaes (1536–1615). According to the Dutch historian Gerard Brandt

rimus necessarium esse, ut fideles inter se communionem colant, et vinculo Verbi et Sacramentorum* secundum Christi institutionem consocientur; nisi forte extremae persecutionis causa ad exiguum tempus eandem communionem interrumpere cogantur.

XXV Demonstrat* illud promissio singularis gratiae* iis facta, qui in nomine Domini congregati sunt, Matt. 18, 20. item finis* institutionis Verbi et Sacramentorum,* et usus disciplinae. *Fides enim est ex auditu, auditus vero per Verbum Dei*, Rom. 10, 17. et *quomodo credent nisi iis praedicetur, quomodo praedicabunt nisi mittantur?* Sic per Baptismum induimus Christum, Rom. 6. Gal. 3. Coena Domini est communio corporis et sanguinis Domini, 1 Cor. 10. Imo vero Christus, Eph. 4, 11. *alios quidem dedit* non solum *Apostolos, Prophetas et Evangelistas*, sed etiam *Pastores ac Doctores, ad coagmentationem Sanctorum, ad opus ministerii, ad aedificationem corporis Christi, donec evadamus omnes in unitatem fidei et agnitionis Filii Dei*, etc. Atque ideo mandamur in celebratione s. Coenae, *Commemorare mortem Domini donec veniat*, 1 Cor. 11, 26. et in offensis fraternis, *dicere Ecclesiae*, Matt. 18, 17.

XXVI Haec Ecclesia militans varie dividitur: primo in Ecclesiam Veteris Testamenti et Novi, quae et a nonnullis Catholica vocatur, quia jam certae regioni, urbi, aut templo alligata non est, quemadmodum olim fuit, *sed in omnem terram exivit sonus eorum, et in fines orbis terrarum verba eorum*, Rom. 10, 18. Et licet olim Gentiles absque Christo et alieni a Republica Israëlis, essent extranei a pactis promissionum, etc. *nunc tamen in Christo Jesu illi qui olim erant procul, propinqui facti sunt per sanguinem Christi: ipse enim est pax nostra, qui utraque fecit unum, et intergerivi parietis septum solvit*, etc. Eph. 2, 12. et seqq.

(1626–1685), the 'libertines' either failed to attend worship services altogether or else did not discriminate between different confessions; see Mirjam G.K. van Veen, "Spiritualism in The Netherlands: From David Joris to Dirck Volckertsz Coornhert," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 33 (2002): 129–150, 129. Walaeus speaks of their "unknown church" and not "invisible Church" because of the positive role the latter had obtained in Protestant ecclesiology after Melanchthon.

the true Church it is necessary for believers to have communion with each other, and to be joined together by the bond of Word and Sacraments* according to their institution by Christ, unless it happens because of extreme persecution that they are compelled to break off their communion for a short time.

The promise of particular grace* that is made for those who have been 25
gathered in the name of the Lord demonstrates* this (Matthew 18:20), and so too the goal* of the institution of the Word and sacraments* and of the use of discipline.[17] "For faith comes by hearing, and hearing comes through the word of God" (Romans 10:17); and, "how are they to believe unless someone preaches to them, and how are they to preach unless they are sent?" For thus through baptism we have put on Christ (Romans 6; Galatians 3). The supper of the Lord is the communion of the body and blood of the Lord (1 Corinthians 10). Indeed, Christ in Ephesians 4:11 "has not only given some apostles, prophets and evangelists, but also pastors and teachers, in order to equip the saints, for the works of ministry, for the building up of the body of Christ, until we shall all attain to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God." And for this reason we are commanded in the celebration of the holy supper "to commemorate the Lord's death until he comes," (1 Corinthians 11:26) and in case a brother does not listen to us, "to tell it to the church" (Matthew 18:17).

This militant Church is divided in different ways: first, into the Church of 26
the Old and the New Testament. Some also call [the latter] the catholic Church because nowadays it is not bound to any particular region, city, or temple-building, as it had been formerly, "but the sound of their voice has gone into all the world, and their words even to the ends of the world" (Romans 10:18). And although formerly the gentiles apart from Christ and alienated from the nation of Israel were strangers to the covenants of promises, "yet now in Christ Jesus those who once were afar off have been brought near through Christ's blood, for he is our peace who has made us both one, and has broken down the middle wall of partition" (Ephesians 2:12 ff.).

17 Calvin lists the preaching of the Word, the administration of the sacraments, and church discipline, as the three marks of the ministers' duties, but only mentions the first two as marks of the Church whereas Martin Bucer did not make this distinction; see Tadataka Maruyama, *The Ecclesiology of Theodore Beza: The Reform of the True Church* (Geneva: Droz, 1998), 24.

XXVII Secundo dividitur a nostris Ecclesia in visibilem et invisibilem; etsi enim aliqui visibilem cum particulari, invisibilem cum universali confundant, nos tamen salvo meliori judicio haec membra confundenda esse non arbitramur.

XXVIII Invisibilis Ecclesia dicitur multitudo credentium et electorum, qui tum in particularibus coetibus, tum in omnibus totius orbis Ecclesiis et locis, Dei oculis conspicui sunt. Quae ideo invisibilis dicitur, quia ipsa illius interna et essentialis* forma, nempe vera fides et sanctitas, ab hominibus non videtur.

Second, we divide the Church into visible and invisible;[18] and although some confuse visible with particular and invisible with universal, we—unless there is a better judgment—think that we should not confuse those elements.[19] 27

The invisible Church is called the multitude of elect believers who, whether they are in specific individual meetings or in all the churches and places throughout the world, are conspicuous to the eyes of God. And so it is called 'invisible' because its inner, essential* form, namely its true faith and holiness, 28

18 The distinction between the visible and invisible Church is rooted in Scripture, especially in the reflection on the parable of the wheat and the tares in Matthew 13:24–30, 36–43. It first came to prominence in the works of Clement of Alexandria and Origen, the latter of whom developed an account of the Church as the invisible, mystical body of Christ. In the Western Church it was Augustine of Hippo who offered the most sophisticated account of this distinction. He contrasted those united to God by charity with the visible, sacramental Church of the baptised (*De Baptismo contra Donatistas*, V.27.38, 28.39; VII.51.99). In both his Anti-Donatist and Anti-Pelagian works he also indexed the distinction to predestination; see John Norman Davidson Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 3rd ed. (London: Continuum, 2007), 191–203, 412–417. The medieval Church took up Augustine's distinctions of faith and love and of elect and reprobate in the discussion of the relation between the visible and invisible Church (Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 3.8.3). In the later Middle Ages, John Wyclif and Jan Hus employed this distinction in support of their radical reform agenda (unlike Augustine) using it to drive a wedge between the visible, papal Church and the invisible, mystical Church of the elect; see Heiko A. Oberman, "Introduction: The Church," in *Forerunners of the Reformation: The Shape of Late Medieval Thought* (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 2002), 207–212. Developing this approach, the Reformers used this distinction to undermine the Roman Catholic claim to be the visible Church on earth. Luther's own reflections on justification led him to a new and more dynamic formulation of the distinction, according to which the Church of the elect could be considered simultaneously visible and invisible; see Euan Cameron, *The European Reformation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 172–173. Among the Reformed, discussion of the distinction led to an account of the 'marks' of the visible Church, with John Calvin in *Institutes* 4.1.7 identifying these as the Word and sacraments, and Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr Vermigli later adding a third category of discipline. It also attained an important place in the Reformed confessions of the later sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (e.g., *Second Helvetic Confession*, chapter 17 and *WCF*, chapter 25). In the polemics of the period the distinction was used by the Reformed to support the Protestant thesis of the continuity of the true (invisible) Church before the Reformation and to attack the Roman Catholic understanding, reaffirmed at the Council of Trent, of the palpable visibility of the true Church. As a consequence, later Reformed theology shows increased sophistication in its handling of this locus.

19 In his *Loci* Walaeus states that the visible Church can be subdivided into the universal or catholic Church and the particular or local churches, but it is not clear who confuse the visible with the particular and the invisible with the universal Church; see Walaeus, *Opera*

Etsi enim non diffiteamur quin ipsa fides et sanctitas interna per confessionem et bona opera se quoque manifestet, tamen cum hypocritae haec omnia ad tempus imitari possint, ideo ex illis solis infallibile de aliis judicium non potest constitui. Unde et Sapiens 1 Reg. 8, 39. testatur, *solum Deum corda nosse omnium filiorum hominis*. Item Christus Joh. 10, 14. *Ego cognosco oves meas, et cognoscor a meis*. Et Apostolus Paulus adversus scandalorum auctores 2 Tim. 2, 19. *Solidum tamen Dei fundamentum stat, habens hoc signaculum, Dominus eos novit qui sunt sui.*

XXIX Multitudinem autem hanc credentium cum Scriptura Ecclesiam vocamus; quia per Verbum et Spiritum Dei ad fidem et sanctitatem hanc e mundo evocantur, et quia sinceram et internam cum Christo et omnibus vere fidelibus communionem et societatem habent. Unde et passim in Scripturis appellatur ejusmodi nominibus,* quae hanc societatem et communionem internam cum Christo et omnibus Sanctis efficaciter denotant.

XXX Hinc vocatur *sponsa et amica Christi*, Cant. 4, 7. et Eph. 5, 27. *Sion Sancta, et Jerusalem coelestis, et Israël Dei*, Esai. 52, 1. et Gal. 4, 26. et 6, 16. item *Ecclesia quam Christus sibi mundavit, ut sisteret eam sibi gloriosam, non habentem maculam aut rugam*, Eph. 5, 27. *Corpus Christi, quod congruenter coagmentatum et compactum est per omnem subministrationis juncturam, juxta vim intus agentem pro mensura cujusque membri*, Eph. 4, 16. Vocatur *populus Christi* quem servat a peccatis suis, Matt. 1, 21. *Unum ovile et unus pastor*, Joh. 10, 16. *Domus Dei et Sacerdotium Sanctum*, 1 Pet. 2, 5. *Templum Dei* in quo Spiritus Dei habitat, 1 Cor. 3, 16. etc. *Conjux agni*, Apoc. 21, 9. etc. quae omnia et similia cum nec hypocritis nec irregenitis, sub quacunque larva tegantur, ullo modo possint* competere, consequitur necessario, Ecclesiam de qua haec dicuntur, esse solam illam quae a nobis antea est descripta.

XXXI Ad hanc Ecclesiam quoque proprie* pertinent omnes salutares et spirituales promissiones, quae Ecclesiae Dei passim in Scriptura fiunt, a quibus tam hypocritae quam injusti excluduntur; et inter ceteras promissiones etiam haec, quod nunquam in hoc mundo deficiet, ut Jer. 31, 36. *Si defecerint leges Solis et Lunae coram me, dicit Dominus, tunc et semen Israël deficiet, ut non sit gens cunctis diebus*. Sic Matt. 16, 18. *Portae inferorum non praevalebunt adversus eam*. Hinc Matt. 24, 24. testatur Christus *fieri non posse ut seducantur electi*, et Apoc. 13, 8.

1:458. According to Bavinck, the young Zwingli identified the invisible with the universal Church; see Bavinck, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 4:289.

are not seen by mortal people.[20] For whereas we do not deny that through confession and good works the very faith and inner sanctity also make themselves evident, yet because hypocrites are able to imitate all these for a period of time, it follows that on the basis of only those things one cannot make an infallible judgment about other people. Therefore also the wise man in 1 Kings 8:39 testifies that "only God knows the hearts of all the sons of men." Similarly Christ says in John 10:14: "I know my sheep and my sheep know me." And the apostle Paul says against the scandal-mongers in 2 Timothy 2:19: "God's firm foundation stands, and has this seal: 'the Lord knows those who are his.'"

29 Along with Scripture we give to this multitude of believers the name *ecclesia* ['the called'] because by God's Word and Spirit they have been called out of the world to faith and holiness, and because they have a genuine and inner communion and fellowship with Christ and all true believers. And therefore throughout the Scriptures it is called by names* of the sort that effectively denote this inner fellowship and communion with Christ and all the saints.

30 Hence this Church is called the "betrothed and love of Christ" (Song of Solomon 4:7; Ephesians 5:27), "holy Zion" and "heavenly Jerusalem" and "the Israel of God" (Isaiah 52:1; Galatians 4:26, and 6:16). And similarly: "The Church which Christ has cleansed for himself, that he should make her glorious for himself, not having any spot or wrinkle" (Ephesians 5:27). "The body of Christ, fitly joined and held together by what every joint supplies, according to the inner working in the measure of each part" (Ephesians 4:16). It is called "the people of Christ" whom he saves from its sins (Matthew 1:21). "One fold and one shepherd" (John 10:16); the "house of God and holy priesthood" (1 Peter 2:5); the "temple of God" in which the Holy Spirit dwells (1 Corinthians 3:16), etc. "The wife of the Lamb" (Revelation 21:9), etc. Since all these and similar things can* in no way at all apply to the hypocrites and unregenerates (whatever mask they hide behind), it necessarily follows that the Church whereof these things are said is only that one which we have described earlier.

31 And to this Church, too, properly* belong all the salutary and spiritual promises that are made to the Church of God everywhere in Scripture; both the hypocrites and the unrighteous are excluded from these promises. And among the other promises there occurs also this one: that the Church will never be lacking in this world, as Jeremiah 31:[35 and]36 says: "'If the ordinances for the sun and the moon cease from before me,' says the Lord, 'then also will the offspring of Israel cease from being a nation, for all days.'" And so Matthew 16:18: "The gates of hell will not prevail against her;" and hence Christ testifies in Matthew 24:24: "It will not be possible for the elect to be led astray." And

20 Cf. the definition in Walaeus's *Loci*; see *Opera* 1:455.

et alibi ab Antichristi seductione et mundi totius apostasia eximuntur illi, *quorum nomina scripta sunt in libro Vitae agni*.

XXXII Visibilis Ecclesia est coetus eorum qui per verbum externum, Sacramentorum* ac disciplinae Ecclesiasticae usum, in unum externum corpus ac societatem coalescunt, quae Ecclesia visibilis appellatur, non tam quia homines ipsi visibiles sunt. sed quia ipsorum ordo, professio, et communio sensibus externis exponuntur.

XXXIII Haec Ecclesia visibilis consideratur duobus modis,* vel ut coetus aliquis particularis unius pagi, urbis, aut provinciae, eorum scilicet qui inter se non tantum communitate fidei ac Sacramentorum,* sed etiam regiminis externi forma, et Ecclesiasticis ritibus colligantur; vel ut coetus aliquis oecumenicus et universalis per totum orbem diversis locis dispersus, licet ipsa regiminis externi forma ac ritibus circumstantialibus saepe multum inter se differant, communitate tamen fidei et Sacramentorum essentiali* conveniens, unde et illud frequens apud Cyprianum, *Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur*.[a]

XXXIV Haec Ecclesia visibilis non est proprie* alia Ecclesia ab invisibili, sed alio tantum modo* consideratur, illa in fieri, haec in facto esse, quemadmodum domus quae aedificatur et aedificata est. Nam in visibili Ecclesia illa invisibilis, antea nobis descripta, colligitur et formatur; invisibilis in illa visibili haeret ac continetur.

XXXV Atque hinc fit ut visibilis Ecclesia tam particularis quam universa, ita nunquam sit pura et sincera, ut nulli hypocritae et impii ei sint immixti; sicut Christus eam propterea *Reti* comparat in quo boni et mali pisces capiuntur, item *agro* et *areae*, in qua purum frumentum cum zizaniis crescit et colligitur, et *convivio nuptiali*, in quo et illi nonnunquam comparent, qui nuptiali veste induti non sunt. Atque ideo et Apostolus Paulus eam confert cum *magna domo, in qua non tantum sunt vasa aurea et argentea ad decus, sed et fictilia et lignea ad dedecus*, 2 Tim. 2, 20.

[a] Cf. Cyprian of Carthage, *On the Unity of the Church* 2.

Revelation 13:8, and elsewhere, testifies that "those whose names are written in the book of life of the Lamb" will be spared from being led astray by the Antichrist and from the whole world's apostasy.

32 The visible Church is the gathering of those who through the outward Word, the use of the sacraments* and church discipline, are formed together into one outward body and fellowship, which is called the visible Church, not so much because the people themselves are visible, but because their organization, public profession and communion are displayed to the outward senses.[21]

33 There are two modes* wherein this visible Church is considered: either as some particular meeting of a single district, city, or province, i.e., of those people who are bound to each other not just in the community of faith and sacraments,* but also in the form of their outward governance and rites of the Church. Or as some ecumenical and universal meeting scattered in diverse places across the entire globe, even though in the very form of outward governance and circumstantial rites they often differ very much from each other, yet they are harmonious in the essential* community of faith and sacraments, and for this reason it says repeatedly in Cyprian that "there is one bishopric, and a part of it is held as a whole by each [bishop]."

34 This visible Church is strictly* speaking not different from the invisible Church, but it is only considered in a different way:* the former as 'coming about,' the latter as 'having come about'—like a house that is being built and a house that has been built. For that invisible Church which we described beforehand is gathered and formed within the visible Church. The invisible Church is inherent in and contained by the visible one.

35 And hence it happens that the visible Church (particular as well as universal) is never so pure and sincere that not any hypocrites and godless people are mixed in with it, just as Christ therefore compares it to a "net"[22] that catches good as well as bad fish, and to a "field"[23] and "threshing floor"[24] wherein the wholesome grain is grown and gathered together with the weeds, and to a "wedding banquet" where even those people sometimes appear who are not clothed in a wedding garment.[25] And so also the apostle Paul compares it to "a house, in which there are not only articles of gold and silver, but also of wood and clay; some are for honorable use, some for dishonorable" (2 Timothy 2:20).[26]

---

21 Cf. the definition in Walaeus's *Loci* (*Opera* 1:455, 458).

22 Matthew 13:47–50.

23 Matthew 13:24–30.

24 Matthew 3:12, Luke 3:17.

25 Matthew 22:1–14.

26 In his *Loci* Walaeus uses similar arguments against the position of the Anabaptists that he equates with that of the Donatists. (*Opera* 1:458).

XXXVI Etsi vero haec Ecclesia ab hypocritis et impiis nunquam plene sit libera, tamen et hypocritas, quantum potest, detegere, et impios per claves a Christo concessas tenetur e suo coetu excludere, secundum praescriptum Christi, Matt. 18, 17. et Apoc. 2, 2. et 14. ipsos vero fideles in vitae aut fidei defectum prolapsos, per eandem disciplinam ad resipiscentiam seriam potenter revocare, ut Paulus monet, 1 Cor. 5, 5.

XXXVII Haec Ecclesia visibilis respectu doctrinae et morum vel pura est vel impura: impura rursum vel simpliciter errans, vel haeretica, vel schismatica.

XXXVIII Ecclesiam simpliciter errantem vocamus, quae errores quidem aliquos tuetur ac fovet, sed qui fundamentum* fidei, nempe Christum et officium ejus, 1 Cor. 3, 11. non evertunt, ita tamen ut parata sit quotidie proficere, et errores, quorum convicta fuerit, ad Dei praescriptum corrigere; qualis fuit Ecclesia Galatica, Corinthiaca, Colossensis, etc. in quibus Apostolus graves quidem errores reprehendit, quia tamen vel fundamentum non concernebant, vel ipsi pertinaces in erroribus non fuerunt, idcirco Apostolus eas quidem graviter repre hendit, nec tamen ab earum communione aut se aut fideles separat.

XXXIX Ecclesiam haereticam vocamus, quae in articulis gravis momenti et fundamentalibus ita errat, ut omnem correctionem respuat, et in errore pertinaciter perseveret. *Pertinacia enim est de formali ratione haereseos*: tum enim quis demum pro Ethnico et Publicano est habendus, quando Ecclesiam recte monentem audire non vult, ut Christus monet, Matt. 18, 17. et Paulus Gal. 5, 12.

XL Haeresis est duorum generum, vel quae directe fundamentum,* id est, Christum vel ejus officium evertit; vel indirecte et per consequentiam, ut vocant;

But even though this Church is never entirely free of hypocrites and godless 36
people, still it is bound, as much as possible, to expose the hypocrites and by the keys Christ has granted it to exclude the godless from its meeting, in accordance with the command of Christ (Matthew 18:17; Revelation 2:2 and 14).[27] But as for the believers themselves who have fallen into sin in their conduct of life or faith, she is bound to call them back powerfully by the same discipline to genuine repentance, as Paul advises in 1 Corinthians 5:5.

With respect to doctrine and moral conduct this visible Church is either 37
pure or impure; then again, the impure is either simply erring, or heretical, or schismatic.[28]

We call a church simply erring when it does indeed harbor and foster some 38
false teachings, but only those that do not ruin the foundation* of the faith, i.e., Christ and his office (1 Corinthians 3:11), and yet it does so in a way that it is prepared daily to improve and to correct the false teachings of which it was convicted, as God has commanded. Such a church was the one in Galatia, Corinth, Colossae, etc., wherein the apostle reproved errors that were indeed serious, but which did not concern the foundation of the faith nor were the people themselves obstinate in their errors. Therefore the apostle certainly reproves them seriously, but he does not remove either himself or the believers from having communion with them.

We give the name heretical to a church that errs in articles of grave 39
importance—fundamental articles—to such a degree that it spurns all reproof and obstinately persists in error. "For obstinacy is a formal quality of heresy."[29] For we ought to treat someone as a heathen and publican only at the time when he will not listen to the Church when it is rightly admonishing him, as Christ advises in Matthew 18:17 and Paul in Galatians 5:12.

There are two kinds of heresy: the kind that directly ruins the foundation,* 40
that is, Christ or his office; or the kind that ruins them indirectly and as a consequence (as they say).[30] Scripture calls people of the first kind antichrists

27 Church discipline or church government, also called 'power of the keys,' is discussed in disputation 48.

28 Walaeus here turns to the discussion of the marks of the Church; see also the more extensive discussion in his *Loci* (*Opera* 1:462–466).

29 Obstinacy or contumacy was generally seen as part of the definition of 'heresy,' often with reference to Augustine (*On the City of God*, book 18, chapter 51). Both terms occur in the formal definitions of 'heresy' given in the *Decretum Gratiani*, the medieval collection of canon law, canons 29–31, cause 24, question 3, Aemilius Friedberg, *Corpus iuris canonici* (Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1879), 998.

30 The distinction between heresy in a direct and an indirect way is already found in Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 2/2.11.2. In his *Loci* Walaeus refers to the distinction in the

quorum primi ab ipsa Scriptura Antichristi et Apostatae appellantur, posteriores generali voce* Pseudoprophetae aut falsi doctores.

XLI Schismatica Ecclesia proprie* dicitur, quae in fundamentis* fidei cum orthodoxa Ecclesia consentiens, tamen vel propter externos aliquos ritus ἀδιαφόρους, vel propter lapsus aliquos particulares in moribus, communionem Christianam abrumpit, et separatos coetus erigit. *Quemadmodum enim haeretici de Deo falsa sentiendo, fidem ipsam violant: ita schismatici disscissionibus iniquis a fraterna caritate dissiliunt, quamvis ea credunt quae credimus*, ut August. de Fide et Symbolo[a] recte loquitur; etsi et hoc ex Thomae 2. parte secunda[b] addendum, *schismaticos proprie* dici qui ex intentione sine idonea causa, ab Ecclesiae unitate se dividunt.*

XLII Quaeritur hic, an cum Ecclesia haeretica et schismatica liceat Christiano communionem colere? Respondemus, cum errante in fide et moribus communionem colendam, et omni modo operam dandam ut ab errore et schismate revocetur, quemadmodum a Christo et Apostolis passim factum videmus. Cum proprie* dicta tamen haeretica et schismatica, quum ea sint opera carnis, communionem Christianam servandam negamus, ex praescripto Christi, Matt. 7, 15. atque Apostoli, Rom. 16, 17. et Tit. 3, 10. et 2 Joh. 9. etc.

XLIII Puram Ecclesiam vocamus, quae et praedicationem verbi, et confessionem fidei habet puram atque integram. Etsi enim nulla Ecclesia in terris sit, quae ita pura sit atque integra, ut nihil in ea vel in fide vel moribus possit requiri, tamen a praedominante doctrinae parte hic denominandam esse censemus cum Apostolo, Phil. 3, 15. *Quotquot perfecti sumus, hoc sentiamus, quod si quid aliter sentitis, hoc quoque Deus vobis revelabit: attamen in eo ad quod pervenimus, eadem incedamus regula, et itidum simus affecti.*

[a] Augustine, *De fide et symbolo* 10 (CSEL 41:27). [b] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 2/2.39.1.

early church between heretics that had to be rebaptized because they denied the divinity of Christ and those that did not have to be rebaptized, and especially to the case of the followers of Paul of Samosata of whom the Council of Nicaea (canon 19) decreed that they had to be rebaptized (*Opera* 1:462).

and apostates, and it calls the latter by the general name* of false prophets or false teachers.

41 Strictly* speaking a schismatic church is one that agrees with the orthodox Church in the fundamental elements* of the faith; yet because of some outward rites that are indifferent in nature,[31] or because of some particular failings in moral conduct, it makes a break with the Christian communion and starts up separate meetings. "For in the same way as heretics violate faith itself by having false notions about God, so too do schismatics break away from the love of the brotherhood by their unjust deeds of separation, even though they believe what we believe," as Augustine rightly says (*On Faith and the Creed*). Yet we should add also this point from Thomas [Aquinas]: "Strictly* speaking people are called schismatics who purposefully remove themselves without a suitable cause from the unity of the Church" ([*Summa theologiae*] book 2, part 2).[32]

42 Here the question arises whether it is permitted for a Christian to foster communion with a church that is heretical and schismatic. And our answer is that we should foster communion with a church that is erring in the faith and moral conduct, and we should make the effort in every way so that it may be called back from its error and schism, just as we see was done everywhere by Christ and the apostles. But with a church that properly* speaking is heretical and schismatic, since its works belong to the flesh, we say that we must not maintain Christian communion, according to the command of Christ (Matthew 7:15) and the apostle (Romans 16:17; Titus 3:10; 2 John 9, etc.).

43 We call a church pure when it keeps the preaching of the Word and the confession of faith pure and intact. For although there is no church on earth which is so pure and intact that nothing more could be required of it in faith or moral conduct, nevertheless we deem that we here should call it thus on the basis of the dominant part of the doctrine, along with the apostle in Philippians 3:15: "Let us, as many as are perfect, be thus minded, that if in anything you are otherwise minded, God will reveal this also to you. But in what we have already reached, let us walk by the same rule, and let us be of the same mind."

---

31 For the indifferent things (*adiaphora*) see *SPT* 35.32, note 32.

32 Walaeus seems to quote *Summa theologiae* 2/2.39.1, which deals with schism. However, in this text no mention is made of 'a suitable cause.' Aquinas writes: "Schismatics properly so called are those who, willfully and intentionally (*sponte et ex intentione*) separate themselves from the unity of the Church." It could be that Walaeus paraphrases the term *sponte* as 'without suitable cause' but it looks as if he is twisting Aquinas's words so that they better fit his definition of 'schismatics.'

XLIV Ex iis quae antea explicata sunt, satis apparet solutio ad quaestionem inter Pontificios et nos controversam, an scilicet Ecclesia errare ac deficere possit?* Ecclesia enim electorum et invisibilis, etsi in circumstantialibus errare possit, tamen eam a fide nunquam deficere posse credimus, quia si deficeret, Ecclesia Christi esse desineret; visibilem vero Ecclesiam quod attinet, ipsi Pontificii nobiscum agnoscunt, particulares Ecclesias deficere posse, etsi suam Romanam sine ulla ratione* hinc excipere conentur; et plurimas sane Ecclesias defecisse experientia et Scriptura testetur. Universa vero visibilis Ecclesia, etsi in magnas angustias redigi possit,* et ad tempus, mundi et persecutorum oculos nonnunquam effugere cogatur, quemadmodum praedictum fuit sub Antichristi tempore futurum, 2 Thess. 2. et Apoc. 11. 12. et 17. etc. credimus tamen Deum semper non tantum pios et fideles aliquos in mediis persecutionibus ac defectionibus mundi conservaturum, sed etiam omnibus seculis et temporibus fideles pastores excitaturum; qui eosdem pios verbo et Sacramentis* sint pasturi, et alios per idem verbum invitis inferorum portis ad eandem Christi invisibilem Ecclesiam collecturi, idque secundum promissionem Christi, Matt. 28, 20. *Ego vobiscum ero omnibus diebus usque ad consummationem seculi.*

XLV Unde etiam satis liquet, veras et essentiales* hujus Ecclesiae purae et visibilis notas, esse puram praedicationem et receptionem verbi, obsignatam per legitimum usum Sacramentorum,* et vindicatam per verum usum clavium, seu disciplinae Ecclesiasticae, secundum institutionem Christi; et quantum ab ea institutione et verbi puritate receditur, tantum quoque a vera et salvifica Ecclesiae puritate receditur.

XLVI Nam si impura et falsa Ecclesia ex impuritate et falsitate doctrinae cognoscitur, quemadmodum antea probatum,* et Christus Matt. 7, 16. et Johannes 2 Epist. v. 10. testatur, puram et veram Ecclesiam ex doctrinae puritate et veritate dignosci est necessarium. Unde et *eos qui ex Deo sunt, Christus ex eo describit, quod audiant verbum Dei*, Joh. 8, 47. et *oves suas, ex eo, quod vocem Pastoris audiunt, ac cognoscunt eam, peregrinum autem non sequuntur sed ab eo fugiunt, quia vocem peregrinorum non norunt*, Joh. 10, 4.

From the things that have been explained earlier there appears a satisfactory answer to the question debated between the papal teachers and us whether the Church can* err and defect. For we believe that the Church of the elect, the invisible Church, although it can err in matters that are circumstantial, can never fall away from the faith because if it should fall away, it would cease to be the Church of Christ. But as far as the visible Church is concerned, the papal teachers themselves acknowledge with us that individual churches can fall away, even though they try to make an exception—without reason*—for the Roman church; both experience and Scripture bear witness that certainly very many churches have fallen away. But as for the universal, visible Church, even though it can be driven to suffer the greatest hardships and for a period of time be forced to flee from the eyes of the world and those who persecute it (as was foretold would happen during the time of the Antichrist: 2 Thessalonians 2, and Revelation 11,12 and 17, etc.), we believe that God not only will always preserve some godly and believing people in the midst of persecutions and desertion by the world, but he will even raise up faithful shepherds in all ages and times. And these shepherds will feed the same godly people with the Word and the sacraments,* and shall gather others through the same Word, despite the opposition of the gates of hell, to that same invisible Church of Christ, and shall do so according to Christ's promise in Matthew 28:20: "I shall be with you all the days, even to the end of the age." 44

And from this it is also sufficiently clear that the true, essential* marks of this pure and visible Church are the pure preaching, and reception, of the Word, sealed by the lawful use of the sacraments,* and upheld by the true use of the keys (or church discipline), according to the institution by Christ.[33] And however great the falling-away from that institution and purity of the Word is, so great also is the falling-away from the true, saving purity of the Church. 45

For if the impure and false church is known by the impurity and falsehood of doctrine, as we have shown* earlier and as Christ (Matthew 7:16) and John (2 John: 10) testify, then it must be the case that the Church which is pure and true is to be known by the purity and truth of its doctrine. Therefore Christ also depicts "those who belong to God" by the fact that "they listen to the word of God" (John 8:47) and "his sheep" by the fact that "they hear the voice of the Shepherd and recognize it; but they do not follow a stranger but flee from him, because they do not know the voice of strangers" (John 10:4–5). 46

33 In his *Loci* Walaeus makes a distinction between the marks that belong to the being (*esse*) of the Church, the preaching and acceptance of the truth, and those that belong to the well-being (*bene esse*) of the Church, the preaching of the Word, the administration of the sacraments and church discipline (*Opera* 1:462).

XLVII Quod hinc etiam manifestum est, quia communicatio et acceptio tabularum foederis, sunt certum signum populi foederati; cum nemine enim Deus foedus facit, cui tabulas foederis non communicat. Unde et Gentiles ab Ecclesia Israëlis alienos, sine foederibus fuisse dicit Apostolus loco antea citato Eph. 2, 12. et contra, populum Israëlem usque ad adventum Christi fuisse Dei Ecclesiam hinc demonstrat* Apostolus, quod ad ipsos foedera pertinebant, Rom. 9, 4. Verbum autem Dei esse tabulas illas Dei foederis nemo ambigit, atque id ipsa vox* Testamenti evincit, et signa ac sigilla illius foederis esse Sacramenta,* est extra controversiam inter Christianos.

XLVIII Unde etiam fit, ut, cum Deus Ecclesiam suam in populo aliquo erigit, aut jam collapsam restaurat, non aliter id quam per Verbum et Sacramenta* praestet; quemadmodum videmus Deum per Mosis ministerium erexisse Ecclesiam inter Israëlitas, cum eis Verbum suum et verbi sigilla dedit, et Christum per Apostolos suos Ecclesias per totum mundum propagasse, cum hoc mandato: *Ite et docete omnes gentes, baptizantes eos in nomine Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, et docete eos observare quaecunque praecepi vobis*, Matt. 28, 19. et 20.

XLIX Perperam ergo Pontificii, cum se hac veritate destitutos vident, alias Ecclesiae notas comminiscuntur, in quarum tamen designatione multum discrepant, aliis 15. aliis 8. aliis 4. tantum notas assignantibus; praecipuae tamen hae sunt, antiquitas, successio Episcoporum, multitudo profitentium, et miracula, quibus Bellarminus[a] addit nomen Catholici, unitatem in doctrinae professione, doctrinae efficaciam, sanctitatem Doctorum quorundam, et imprimis eorum qui Monachorum ordines instituerint, denique magnas victorias obtentas adversus eos quos haereticos appellat.

[a] Bellarmine, *De Notis Ecclesiae* 4–18 (*Opera* 2:366–407).

47 This is evident also from the fact that the communication and reception of the tables of the covenant are a sure sign of a people that has entered into a covenant; for God does not enter into a covenant with anyone with whom He does not also communicate the tables of that covenant. Therefore the apostle says (in a place earlier cited, Ephesians 2:12) that the heathens as strangers to the church of Israel were without covenants. And on the other hand, the apostle shows* clearly that the people of Israel right up to the coming of Christ were the Church of God by the fact that the covenants pertained to them (Romans 9:4). Moreover, no-one doubts that the tables of the covenant are the Word of God, and even the very word* 'testament' proves it; and among Christians it is a matter beyond debate that the signs and seals of that covenant are sacraments.*[34]

48 And hence it even happens that when God erects his Church among some people, or restores one that had already lapsed, He brings it about in no other way than through Word and sacrament.* We see in this way that God erected the Church among the Israelites through the ministry of Moses, when He gave them his Word and the seals of his Word; and through his apostles Christ extended the churches throughout the whole world with this command: "Go and teach all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and teach them to observe all the things that I have commanded you" (Matthew 28:19–20).

49 Therefore the papal teachers, when they realize that they are bereft of this truth, erroneously invent different marks of the Church, even though in identifying these they differ greatly, since some assign fifteen, others eight, and others only four marks.[35] However, they are chiefly these: its old age, the succession of bishops, the great number of those who profess it, and miracles. Bellarmine adds to these the name 'Catholic,' the unity in the profession of doctrine, the efficacy of the doctrine, and the saintly status of some of the Doctors—especially of those who have established the orders of monks—and lastly, the great victories that have been won over those whom he calls heretics.

---

34 See also *SPT* 23.2–4 on the terms 'covenant' and 'testament.'

35 In his *Loci* Walaeus says that Bellarmine lists 15 marks and relates them to the four marks in the apostolic Creed: one, holy, catholic, and apostolic (*Opera* 1:464); cf. Bellarmine, *Disputationes*, controversy 4, book IV, "De notis Ecclesiae," chapter 3 (*Opera* 2:366). He acknowledges that other contemporary Roman Catholic theologians give different numbers. Cardinal Hosius in his *Confession of the Catholic Faith* (chapter 20) lists the four marks of the Creed (*Opera* 10b). Johann Gerhard sums up different numbers of the marks of the Church from contemporary Roman Catholic theologians (locus 22, chapter 10.147) but he mentions no-one who has eight marks (*Loci* 5:388).

L Sed ut praetereamus, quasdam ex his notis non esse certas, quasdam non esse perpetuas, omnes vero eas semper sibi vendicasse Gentiles, et adhuc vendicare Mahumetanos; ut mittam jam Ecclesias Graecas et Aethiopicas, quae a Pontificiis pro heterodoxis habentur, easdem sibi non minori jure tribuere quam Pontificios, dicimus eos occulto sane Dei judicio sibi diserte tribuere eas notas, quas ipsa Scriptura Antichristi Ecclesiae manifesto assignat.

LI Prima ergo est *Antiquitas*, nam jam tum Apostolorum tempore operabatur mysterium iniquitatis; *Successio et nomen Catholici*, nam sedet in templo Dei; *Multitudo et unitas profitentium*, nam totus mundus adorat bestiam, et abit post eam; *Miracula*, nam venit cum signis et prodigiis mendacii; *Doctrinae efficacia*, nam mittit Deus efficaciam erroris ut credant mendacio; *Sanctitas auctorum Monachatus*, nam venit in veste ovili et habet cornua duo similia agno; ac denique *Victoriae adversus fideles, quos ipsi haereticos vocant*, nam bestia ascendens ex abysso geret adversus Sanctos bellum et vincet eos, et Christi Ecclesiam in desertum fugabit. Haec omnia manifesta sunt ex 2 Thess. 2. Apoc. 11. et 12. et 15. et 17. etc.

But let us pass over the fact that some of these marks are not certain, that 50
some are not continuous, and that heathens had always claimed all of them for themselves (and the Mohammedans still do). And let me disregard the fact that the Greek and Ethiopian churches, which the papal teachers consider to be heterodox, ascribe the same marks to themselves with no less right than the papal teachers do. We state that by the truly secret judgment of God they obviously ascribe to themselves those marks that Scripture itself clearly assigns to the church of the Antichrist.

The first mark [of the church of the Antichrist] is its old age,[36] for it was 51
already in the time of the apostles that the mystery of iniquity was at work; the succession and name 'Catholic,' for he [i.e. the Antichrist] takes his seat in the temple of God; the great number and unity of those who profess it, for the entire world is worshiping the beast and follows after it; the miracles, for it is accompanied by signs and portents of the lie; the efficacy of the doctrine, for God sends the efficacy of error so that they believe the lie; the saintly status of the founders of monastic orders, for it comes in sheep's clothing and has two horns, like a lamb; and finally, the victories over the believers, whom they themselves call heretics, for the beast will rise out of the abyss and wage war against the saints and conquer them, and it will cause the Church of Christ to flee into the desert. All of these are made manifest in 2 Thessalonians 2, Revelation 11, 12, 15, and 17, etc.

36 The other marks are not numbered. Walaeus selects a number of the marks of the Church listed by Bellarmine; see also Walaeus *Opera* 1:464–466.

DISPUTATIO XLI

De Christo Capite Ecclesiae et de Antichristo[a]

Praeside D. ANTONIO THYSIO
Respondente GUILIELMO SURENDONCK

THESIS I De *Ecclesia Dei*, quae corpus Christi est, ejusque notis, superiore disputatione cum actum sit, sequitur ut de ejus *Capite Christo*, et contra de *Antichristo*, malignantis Ecclesiae Capite, breviter dispiciamus.

II *Per Caput Ecclesiae*, metaphorice intelligimus, Christum θεάνθρωπον ac Mediatorem, supremam et absolutam* dignitatem, majestatemque, auctoritatem, potestatem et jus habentem, et exercentem, quo ipse (ut in quo est omnium quae ad salutem requiruntur, plenitudo, et ad Ecclesiam conveniens symmetria, et cum ea conjunctio et unio) in Ecclesiam universam Spiritu suo per verbum* efficaciter influit, omnia bona spiritualia ei communicat, eam vivificat, regit et defendit, idque tum interne, tum externe, ad salutem ejus, Deique gloriam.

III Haec porro Christi Filii Dei et hominis in *Ecclesiam potestas et efficacitas*, variis in Scriptura Sacra similitudinibus declaratur. Ac primo quidem a *rebus Physicis*, videlicet a *Capite* et reliquo corpore deducta. Cum enim Ecclesia sit instar corporis, ἀκέφαλος, *sine capite*, et unum corpus, πολυκέφαλος, *multiceps*. esse nequit. Illud autem unicum Ecclesiae caput est Christus, Rom. 12, 4. 5. *Multi*

[a] In the original catalogue of disputations (1620) the intended title was *De Christo unico Capite Ecclesiae et de Antichristo*. In *SPT* 26.51 Polyander calls the disputation *De Christo unico Ecclesiae capite*. For the original catalogue see Sinnema and Van den Belt, "The *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* (1625) as a Disputation Cycle," 532–533.

DISPUTATION 41

On Christ as Head of the Church, and on the Antichrist

President: Antonius Thysius
Respondent: Guilielmus Surendonck[1]

Since in the previous disputation we treated the Church of God—which is the body of Christ—and its marks, it follows that we briefly consider Christ its Head, and, on the other hand, the Antichrist, who is the head of the church that does evil.[2] 1

With "head of the Church" we mean Christ the God-and-man, the Mediator, who both possesses and also exercises the supreme and absolute* dignity, majesty, authority, sovereignty and right. Thereby he himself (as the one who has the fullness of everything that is required for salvation, and the harmony that is appropriate to the Church,[3] and, together with that harmony, its bond and unity) flows into the universal Church effectively by his Spirit through the Word,* and imparts to it every spiritual good thing, causes it to come alive, and governs and defends it, and he does so both inwardly and outwardly for its salvation, and for the glory of God. 2

And Holy Scripture indicates this sovereignty and effective power of Christ, the Son of God and man, over the Church by means of different comparisons. Firstly, there is the comparison drawn from the realm of nature, that is, of a head and the rest of the body. For since the Church is like a body, it cannot be headless (*akephalos*), nor can it be a single body with many heads (*polykephalos*). And that one head of the Church is Christ. The "many are one body in 3

1 Born in 1601, Guilielmus Andreae Surendonck came from the province of Brabant and matriculated on April 15, 1619 in theology. He defended this disputation in 1623. He became a rector in Gorinchem, afterwards in Utrecht and finally in Rotterdam; he died in 1662; see Du Rieu, *Album studiosorum*, 140, and *NNBW* 3:1210.

2 The debate with the Roman Catholic Church over its hierarchy and particularly the primacy of the pope belonged to the standard topics of Protestant polemics. As a general background of this disputation, one can consult book 4, chapters 5 to 7, of John Calvin's *Institutes*.

3 The term *symmetria ecclesiae* refers to the harmony achieved within the Church through the diversity in gifts as expressed by the apostle Paul in 1 Corinthians 12:4–6. Thysius may have adopted this term from Calvin, who explicitly evokes it when he uses the variety of sounds in a symphony to illustrate the harmony achieved in the Church; see *Commentary on 1 Corinthians* 12:4 (*CO* 49:497).

unum corpus in Christo, scilicet Capite, Eph. 1, 22. *Constituit*, Deus scilicet, *eum caput super omnia Ecclesiae*, et 4, 15. *Qui est caput, ex quo totum corpus congruenter coagmentatum et compactum per omnes suppeditatas commissuras, ex vi intus agente, pro mensura cujusque membri, incrementum capit corpori conveniens, ad sui ipsius exstructionem per caritatem*, et cap. 5, 23. Item Col. 1, 18. et 2, 10. et 19.

IV Qua quidem Capitis similitudine, summa eminentia, arctissima et proportionata ad supernaturale* hoc Christi corpus symmetria, unio, communio atque συμπάθεια significatur.* Ut enim caput in homine eminens ac suprema corporis pars est, in quo principium* vitae, sensuum et motus est, a quo eorum defluxus et in corpus influxus, malorum aversio, bonorum prospectio, et totius corporis regimen residet; ita Christus supra, in, et circa Ecclesiam spiritualiter sese habet. Atque haec Capitis denominatio ad ceteras quoque extenditur. Unde Caput sponsae dicitur, 1 Cor. 11. et Eph. 5. Caput populi, Caput anguli, etc. dicitur.

V *Secundo a rebus Oeconomicis sumitur*, idque secundum primarias ejus relationes, nempe 1. *Sponsi et Mariti*, scilicet Ecclesiae sponsae et uxoris, Sponsi quidem, Matt. 9, 15. Joh. 3. 29. Apoc. 18, 23. et 21, 9. *Mariti*, vero 2 Cor. 11, 2. Ubi habetur ratio, ut coalitionis utriusque in unam carnem, seu corpus, societatis totalis, ac participationis omnium bonorum, αὐθεντίας et juris maritalis in uxorem, vicissim subjectionis uxoris sub marito, Eph. 5, 24. Affectionis item seu amoris et curae erga uxorem, v. 25. Ita et Christi, cum, super, in et erga Ecclesiam suam.

VI Deinde in genere quidem *Patrisfamilias* suorum, seu propriorum ac domesticorum, a quo tota familia (ut in quam jus habet) dependet ac regitur. Unde

Christ" (Romans 12:4–5), that is, their head. "And He," that is God, "has made him to be the head over all things for the Church" (Ephesians 1:22). And "he is the head, from whom the whole body, fitly joined and held together through all the supporting ligaments by the power that is at work within, according to the measure of each part, takes the increase suitable to the body for building itself up in love" (Ephesians 4:15[–16]; also chapter 5:23). So too Colossians 1:18, 2:10 and 19.

And this comparison to a head expresses* highest preeminence, a most close 4
and proportionate harmony with this supernatural* body of Christ, as well as unity, communion, and concord.[4] For just as a person's head is the pre-eminent and superior part of the body, where the very principle* of life resides, as well as that of the senses and movement, and from where these flow down and into the body,[5] and which steers away from evil and aims at the good, and where the control over the whole body resides, so too does Christ conduct himself spiritually over, in, and around the Church. And this name of 'head' is extended in order to apply also to the other comparisons. Hence he is called the head of the bride (1 Corinthians 11[:3], Ephesians 5[:23]), the head of his people, the chief corner-stone, etc.

The second comparison is taken from domestic affairs, in particular from 5
the parties that are primarily involved in it, namely that of bridegroom, and husband (that is, of the Church his bride and wife). The comparison to a bridegroom is in Matthew 9:15, John 3:29, Revelation 18:23 and 21:9, while that to a husband is in 2 Corinthians 11:2. There the consideration is of two coming together into one flesh or body, of whole conjugal union, and of sharing in all good things together. It is of the authority and marital rights over the woman, and, in return, of the woman's subservience to the man (Ephesians 5:24). Likewise the comparison is of the feelings, or love and care towards the wife (verse 25). And this is how it is also of Christ's relation with, over, in and towards his own Church.

And then there is the general comparison to the head of the family and its 6
members, or to those who belong to him and who are in his household, on

4 The choice of the Greek word *sympatheia* might be explained by reference to Hebrews 4:15, were the verb *sympatheō* is used for Christ's compassion with our infirmities.

5 Thysius here reflects the medieval and early modern thesis of the primacy of the head for its accommodation of the soul as well as its direction of the bodily functions; see Jacques le Goff, "Head or Heart? The Political Use of Body Metaphors in the Middle Ages," in Michel Feher (ed.), *Fragments for a History of the Human Body* (New York: Urzone, 1989), 3:13–26; and Catrien Santing and Barbara Baert, *Disembodied Heads in Medieval and Early Modern Culture*, Intersections 28 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 1.

Christus Paterfamilias, et fideles domestici Dei et Christi dicuntur, Matt. 10, 25. et 36. Luc. 13, 25. Eph. 2, 19.

VII In specie* vero *Patris* filiorum, fratrumque, Matt. 23, 9. *Neque Patres vocemini: unus enim vester omnium Pater, Deus* (scilicet spiritualis) *vos autem omnes fratres*. Esai. 8, 18. Hebr. 2, 13. Esai. 9, 6. et 53, 10. ubi patriae potestatis respectus est. Quamvis alibi improprie* et metonymice, nempe instrumentaliter, quin et ratione affectus,* ministris Dei ea appellatio aliquando communicetur, 1 Cor. 4, 15.

VIII Quin *Heri* et *Domini*, scilicet famulorum et servorum, qualiter simpliciter Dominus, videlicet animae et conscientiae cujusque membri, totiusque Ecclesiae appellatur, Joh. 13, 13. et 14. 1 Cor 8, 5. 6. Quo proprietas, usus, et perfectum summumque in Ecclesia vindicandi disponendique jus indicatur.

IX Denique secundum Oeconomiam χρηματιστικήν, *Pastoris* ovium. Ut enim unum est ovile, ita et unus Pastor, Ezech. 34. et 37. Joh. 10. *ut sit unus pastor et unum ovile*. Unde absolute* Christus dicitur ὁ ποιμὴν, eximius ille pastor, cujus propriae sunt oves, Joh. 10, 11. et 12. ἀρχιποίμην, *princeps pastorum*, 1 Pet. 5, 4. et *magnus ille ovium Pastor*, Heb. 13, 20. Cujus directioni et pastioni omnes, seu tota Ecclesia subest, cujus et unius vocem audit, vers. 4. et 5. Eo tantum communicabilis,* quo ministerium, non imperium, denotat.

X *Tertio ducitur a Politicis rebus*, videlicet a statu in politica sublimissimo, *Monarchae, Regis, Principis, Dominatoris, Gubernatoris et Vicarii*. Reges enim Capita, Patres et Domini populi nominantur passim. Ita et Christus Rex Ecclesiae appellatur, Ps. 2, 6. Esa. 2. Zach. 9, 9. Matt. 21, 5. Luc. 1, 32. Apoc. 1, 5. et 15, 3. et 19, 16. *Et vicarius Dei*, qua a Patre et sub Patre constitutus, vicem ejus

whom the whole family depends and by whom it is ruled (as that is his right). Hence Christ is called the Head of the family and believers are called members of the household of God and Christ (Matthew 10:25, 36; Luke 13:25; Ephesians 2:19).

In particular* the comparison is to a father of sons or brothers: "And you will not be called fathers, for there is one father of you all: God" (i.e., the spiritual father; Matthew 23:9), "for you are all brothers." In Isaiah 8:18, Hebrews 2:13, Isaiah 9:6, and 53:10 the focus is on fatherly sovereignty. Nevertheless, in other places that name is sometimes granted to the servants of God, not in the strict sense,* but by metonymy, i.e., in an instrumental sense, with respect to the feelings* (1 Corinthians 4:15).[6] 7

And there is a comparison also to Master and Lord (i.e., of servants and slaves), in the way that he simply is called Lord, that is, the Lord of every member's heart and conscience, and of the whole Church (John 13:13–14; 1 Corinthians 8:5–6). Hereby his ownership, use, and his perfect and highest right of laying claim over the Church and arranging it is indicated. 8

And finally, in terms of the arrangement of possessions, the comparison is to a shepherd of sheep. For as there is one flock, so too is there one shepherd (Ezekiel 34[:23] and 37[:24]); John 10[:16]: "So that there is one shepherd and one sheepfold." And for this reason Christ is called "the shepherd" in an absolute* sense, that outstanding shepherd to whom the sheep belong (John 10:11–12), the "chief shepherd" (*archipoimēn*, 1 Peter 5:4), the "great shepherd of the sheep" (Hebrews 13:20). Everyone, or the whole Church, is subject to his guidance and pasturage, and it listens to his voice and his alone ([John 10:] 4–5). And to the extent that the term "shepherd" can be communicated* [to others than Christ] it means service and not rule.[7] 9

Thirdly is the comparison drawn from political affairs, namely from that position in politics that is the most elevated: of "monarch," "king," "ruler," "overlord," "governor," and "deputy." For kings are everywhere called heads, fathers, and lords of the people. And so also Christ is called the King of the Church (Psalm 2:6; Isaiah 2[:2–3]; Zechariah 9:9; Matthew 21:5; Luke 1:32; Revelation 1:5, 15:3 and 19:16). And he is called "God's deputy" whereby he, having his posi- 10

6 See thesis 39 below for a critique of the pope's assumption of the name 'father of fathers' for himself.

7 This sentence seems to anticipate the criticism issued against the Roman Catholic papacy in thesis 39 below: while calling himself "the chief shepherd," the pope acts as one "lording over the inheritance" and as "a tyrant to his fellow servants." To the contrary, the pope's alleged predecessor Peter warned his colleague-shepherds "not to lord it over those entrusted to you, but to be examples to the flock" (1 Peter 5:3).

tenet et gerit, 1 Cor. 15, 27. Quibus celsa Christi in Ecclesiam potestas et imperium designatur.

XI Quarto et postremo a *rebus artificialibus* sumitur, scilicet nominibus *fundamenti, petrae, lapidis angularis*, puta aedificii. domus, templi, civitatis spiritualis, id est, Ecclesiae Dei; quae Christo, ut propria tribuuntur, Esai. 28, 16. Dan. 2, 35. 45. Matt. 16, 18. et 21, 42. Act. 4, 11. Rom. 9, 33. 1 Pet. 2, 4. 1 Cor. 3, 11. Eph. 2, 19. Atque *fundamenti* quidem, quod vi sua immotum stet, ipsi innitatur, et ex eo ex surgat reliqua moles aedificii spiritualis; *petrae* vero, ut qua soliditas et firmitas fundamenti indicatur, adeo ut originis, subjecti, sustentationis et stabilimenti habeatur respectus. *Angularis autem lapidis*, ut in quo anguli, puta Judaei et Gentes, concurrant et connectantur. Eademque hujus ad aedificium, quae capitis ad corpus, est proportio.

XII Harum porro omnium similitudinum prima naturae,* et ut postrema, artis naturae imitatricis, tertia vero consensus: Secunda tum naturae, tum consensus est. Quibus omnibus simul mystica haec Christi cum Ecclesia unio et communio (quae illas omnes veritate et efficacia complectitur et excedit) ad majorem evidentiam* explicatur.

XIII His ergo cum prima origo, summa potestas, jus, vis et regimen absolutum* in Ecclesiam significetur,* solius Dei *Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti*, esse evincitur. Christus hujus αὐτεξουσίας et αὐθεντίας, *auctoritatis et potestatis*, non foret capax, nisi verus Deus esset, Hebr. 3, 4. 5. 6. Quamvis *Christus* secundum ordinem, qui est in personis* divinis, certamque redemptioni convenientem oeconomiam* et dispositionem. utpote Deus et homo, dignitatem hanc acceperit a Patre et habeat sub Patre, et quasi vicariam exerceat, pari tamen scientia* et potentia* divina praeditus, 1 Cor. 3, 22. et 11, 3. et 15, 24. 27. 28. Matt. 28. Quemadmodum neque Spiritui Sancto, qui Filio quasi vicarius submittitur, Joh. 14, 16. et 26. et 15, 26. eadem adaequata potestas conveniret, nisi verus Deus esset. Singulariter ergo Christi est, et quidem qua θεάνθρωπος pro officio suo excellenti ejusque efficacia.

XIV Refertur autem et restringitur haec *Christi potestas*, quae alias latissime ad Angelos usque, imo et Diabolos, omnemque adeo potestatem, quocunque

tion from the father and subject to the father, takes his place and rules on his behalf (1 Corinthians 15:27). By this Christ's exalted sovereignty and rule over the Church is designated.

In the fourth and final place is the comparison drawn from the realm of 11
construction, that is, by the words "foundation," "rock," "corner-stone," i.e., of a building, house, temple, spiritual city, namely, of the Church of God. These words are given to Christ in the proper sense (Isaiah 28:16; Daniel 2:35, 45; Matthew 16:18 and 21:42; Acts 4:11; Romans 9:33; 1 Peter 2:4; 1 Corinthians 3:11; Ephesians 2:19): "Foundation" because he stands firm by his own strength, he is supported by himself, and it is from him that the remainder of the spiritual dwelling's structure rises up, "Rock," which shows the solidity and strength of the foundation, so much so that the focus is on the basis, on what lies underneath, on what supports it and what gives it stability, and "Corner-stone," as in him the corners—namely, the Jews and Gentiles—come together and are joined to each other. And the relationship to the building is the same as the one of the head to the body.

And the first of all these comparisons comes from the natural* world, and, 12
like the last one, from art that imitates the natural world; but the third comparison comes from the relational agreement, while the second comes from nature as well as relational agreement. And when the comparisons are all taken together, they explain this mystic union and communion of Christ (which in its truth and efficacy embraces and surpasses them all) with the Church with greater clarity.*

Therefore, since these comparisons signify* the very beginning, the high- 13
est sovereignty, right, power, and absolute* control over the Church, they show convincingly that they belong only to "the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit." Christ would not have been capable of this authority (*autexousia*) and sovereignty (*authentia*) if he were not true God (Hebrews 3:4–6). Nevertheless, by the order that exists among the divine persons,* and by the specific economy* and arrangement suited for redemption, Christ, being God and man, has received this privilege from the Father and holds on to it in subservience to the Father, and exercises it as a deputy, even though he has been endowed with a knowledge* and power* that is divine (1 Corinthians 3:22 and 11:3, and 15:24, 27, 28; Matthew 28[:18]). And likewise, the same adequate sovereignty would not be appropriate to the Holy Spirit if He were not true God, for He acts as it were as the Son's deputy (John 14:16 and 26; and John 15:26). And so this sovereignty belongs especially to Christ, indeed as the God-and-man, in keeping with his exceptional office and its efficacy.

This sovereignty of Christ, which in other respects extends itself very 14
widely—as far as the angels and even to the devils and thus to every sovereignty

nomine censeatur, sese extendit, Col. 2, 10. Heb. 2, 7. 8. singulariter *ad Dei Ecclesiam*. Col. 1, 18. Idque non modo qua interna et invisibilis, sed etiam qua externa et visibilis, quaque universalis et particularis est.

XV Consistit vero in primatu super Ecclesiam, unionis et communionis cum ea principio,* gratiae* in eam defluxu et influxu, seu ejus vivificatione et augmento; nec non gubernatione et regimine ejus in spiritu per verbum suum, idque non tantum interna, sed et externa administratione, quae est in ministrorum vocatione, missione, eorum per verbum suum instructione, etc. quae omnia summae potestatis sunt, et ex praescripto et de rato geri debent. Adeoque haec summa potestas in Ecclesiam, non est κοινωνητὸς sed residet in Christo, ut in proprio subjecto,* omnisque hic potestatis qualiscunque per homines exsecutio, tantum ministerialis est.

XVI Est ergo Christus unicum et solitarium, immediatum* et aeternum *Caput, Sponsus et Maritus, Paterfamilias, Pater, Herus et Dominus, Pastor, Rex, Monarcha, atque fundamentum Ecclesiae Dei, Deique vicarius*. Neque hujus summae potestatis nomina, aut res* ulli communicari possunt,* nisi hujusmodi, et quatenus instrumentum et ministerium hujus potestatis includere possunt.* Omnia enim illa sese habent, ut immediate* ac relative* opposita, correlatis suis correspondentia, Hebr. 3, 5. et 6. Adeo ut illi censeantur in corpore, uxore,

by whatever name it is named (Colossians 2:10; Hebrews 2:7–8)—refers especially to "the Church of God" and is tied to it (Colossians 1:18), not only insofar as it is internal and invisible, but also insofar as it is external and visible, and universal and particular.[8]

[Christ's sovereignty] exists in his primacy[9] over the Church, in the principle* of his union and communion with it, in the downward and inward flowing of his grace* into it (or in his making it come alive and causing it to grow). And it also exists in his governance and control over it by the Spirit through his Word, and that not only by internal administration but also by the external one, which is in the calling and sending forth of ministers, and in their instruction through his Word, etc. All of these things belong to the greatest sovereignty, and should be conducted as prescribed and established.[10] And so this highest sovereignty over the Church cannot be communicated but resides in Christ as the appropriate subject,* and on this point every execution of sovereignty by men of whatever sort is only ministerial. 15

Therefore Christ is the unique, one-and-only, immediate* and eternal Head, Bridegroom and Husband, household-Father, Father, Master and Lord, Shepherd, King, Monarch and Foundation of the Church of God, and the Deputy of God. And neither the names nor the actual substance* of this highest sovereignty can* be communicated to anyone except in this manner and only insofar as the instrument and ministry of this sovereignty can* be included in them. For all these names are so arranged that they correspond to their counterparts, as things that are immediately* and relatively* opposites.[11] (Hebrews 3:5–6). The result is that those who are named that way are also considered 16

8 On these distinctions see *SPT* 40.27.

9 The term 'primacy' (*primatus*) is used here in a technical sense, as the subsequent discussion of the alleged primacy of the pope in the Roman Catholic Church (starting with thesis 17) makes clear.

10 The juridical term *de rato* is found in the *Digesta Justitiani* 3.4.6.3. There it is translated with "ratification." The implication is that only what Christ, as the supreme and sovereign Lord, has prescribed has binding validity in the Church.

11 The taxonomy of correlative terms in thesis 16 is somewhat complicated. On the highest level, only Christ can be called Head, Bridegroom, Shepherd, etc. In relation to him, all members of the Church—'clergy' or 'laity'—stand in the corresponding position of body, bride, sheep, etc. On a subordinate level, however, office-bearers and Church-members can be termed by "immediately and relatively opposites" as head–body, bridegroom–bride, shepherd–flock, etc. The fact that ministers and other office-bearers can in this specific sense be viewed in a 'superior' position does not deny that they belong principally to that very body of which Christ is the proper Head. For an application of this twofold rule to the apostles in general, and Peter in particular, see thesis 19 below.

domesticis, filiis et fratribus, ministris et servis, grege, regno atque aedificio: quocunque gradu et modo,* etiam cum respectu proprii officii cuique competenti, considerentur, ut dum Ministri et Mysteriorum Dei dispensatores, Apostoli et Architecti, Praefecti, Praesides, Duces, Episcopi, Presbyteri, Pastores etc. Dei et Ecclesiae dicuntur. Non quod super Ecclesiam Dei emineant, aut ei immineant, ac potestatem in eam habeant aut exercere debeant, 1 Cor. 3, 21. 22. 23. 1 Pet. 5, 2. 3. et 4. sed tantum quod circa eam ut administri Dei occupentur.

XVII Unde sane nefas est, quod *Pontificii* nomina haec summam et celsam illam potestatem praeferentia, Christoque propria, inter Apostolos *Petro*, et inde ejus, ut volunt, successori *Pontifici Romano*, sub quocunque demum respectu, sive internae communicationis, sive externae gubernationis attribuunt. Equidem Petrus ipse in Christi Ecclesia ejus minister est, communi* ac pari cum reliquis Apostolis ministerii aequalitate. Unde a Christo juxta ac reliqui Apostoli, sub eodem Apostolatus nomine et munere, evocatus ac constitutus est, Joh. 1, 39. 40. Matt. 4, 18. 21. Mittitur et emittitur pariter, Matt. 10, 18. parilique potestate, Joh. 20, 21. pariter promittitur, et accipit Spiritum Sanctum. Neque Apostolorum quisquam se reliquis superiori aliquo nomine ostentat, 1 Pet. 1. et 5, 1. Apostolicus gradus summus est pariter, 1 Cor. 12, 28. Eph. 4, 11. Pari potestate munus exercent, Actor. 15, 28. Christus eos pariter ὁμοθρόνους facit, Matt. 19, 28. Aeque Ecclesia fundata dicitur super fundamentum Apostolorum et Prophetarum; fundamentis novae Jerusalem ex aequo et citra ullam ὑπεροχὴν inscripta sunt nomina duodecim Apostolorum, Apoc. 21, 14. Et peculiariter Jacobus, Cephas et Johannes aequaliter οἱ δοκοῦντες, et pari gradu columnae dicuntur, Gal. 2, 6. 9.

XVIII Singulariter vero Paulus negat, se ab hominibus aut per hominem Apostolatum adeptum, aut ab homine Evangelium accepisse, aut ductu ullius Apostoli praedicasse; cum aliis contulisse quidem, at nihil ab aliis sibi collatum esse, imo mutuo societatis dexteras dedisse, et partito egisse, ut Petrus inter circumcisos, ipse vero inter Gentes versaretur, Gal. 1, 2. *Nihilo e summis Apostolis inferiorem fuisse*, 2 Cor. 11, 5. *Amplius quam illos laborasse*, 1 Cor. 15, 10. Quinimo Petrus ab

to be included in the body, the wife, the members of the household, the sons and brothers, the servants and slaves, the flock, the kingdom and the building, in whatever degree and manner* they are considered, also with respect to the proper office that applies to each of them—such as when they are called ministers and dispensers of the mysteries of God, apostles and builders, prefects, presidents, leaders, overseers, presbyters, shepherds, etc., of God and the Church. Not because they have preeminence over the Church of God or look down upon it and have or should exercise power over it (1 Corinthians 3:21–23; 1 Peter 5:2–4), but only because they are at work around it as God's administrators.

17 Therefore it is clearly wrong of the papal teachers to ascribe to Peter among the apostles those titles that convey the supreme, highest sovereignty—titles that belong to Christ—and from that point on they attribute them (as they would have it) to Peter's successor, the Roman pope, in each and every respect whatsoever (whether of internal communication or external government). But in the Church of Christ Peter himself is his minister, in a ministry that is shared* equally with the other apostles and that is on par with their ministry. For this reason Christ called and appointed him alongside the other apostles with the same title and task (John 1:39–40; Matthew 4:18, 21). He is sent and sent forth on equal terms (Matthew 10:18), and with equal power (John 20:21), and the Holy Spirit is promised equally to him, and He is equally received by him. Nor does any one of the apostles present himself to the others by means of any superior title (1 Peter 1[:1], and 5:1). The highest degree, the apostolic one, is held equally (1 Corinthians 12:28; Ephesians 4:11). They carried out their office with equal power (Acts 15:28). Christ causes them equally to share the throne (Matthew 19:28), and it says that the Church is founded equally on the foundation of the apostles and the prophets. The names of the twelve apostles are inscribed as equals on the foundation-walls of the new Jerusalem, and none is superior to the others (Revelation 21:14). And in particular James, Cephas, and John are equally called "those of repute," and pillars of equal stature (Galatians 2:6 and 9).

18 And Paul in particular states that he had not obtained his apostleship from men or through a man, and it was not from a man that he had received the Gospel, nor was it following the lead of any apostle that he preached. He states that he did in fact confer with the others, but they added nothing to him, and they actually gave each other the right hand of fellowship and went their separate ways, so that Peter would go to the circumcised and Paul himself to the gentiles (Galatians 1:2). "In no way was he [Paul] less than the chief apostles" (2 Corinthians 11:5), and "he had worked harder than they did" (1 Corinthians 15:10). Indeed, it is by the Church and by the other apostles that Peter is sent to

Ecclesia reliquisque Apostolis Antiochiam mittitur, Act. 8, 14. officii rationem* reddit, Act. 11, 2. etc. Imo vero non recto pede incedentem reprehendit, et ei in os resistit Paulus, Gal. 2, 11. etc. Tantum abest, ut Petrus reliquis tamquam caput fuerit impositus, reliquique sub ejus ductu ac directione fuerint.

XIX Concedimus tamen, ut *Apostoli* suo in administratione gradu, pro singulari vocatione et Spiritus Sancti extraordinaria assistentia, primarium locum tenuerunt, ita et εὐταξίας, seu ordinis gratia, *Petrum* inter eos aliquando primas tenuisse; sed ideo potestatem in illos aut universam Ecclesiam habuisse vel exercuisse negamus. Totus autem hic primatus non gradus est inter inferiores, sed ordinis inter pares; et auctoritatis, non jurisdictionis.

XX Neque huic rei firmandae quicquam facit locus Matt. 16. ubi Petro primatus hujus supereminentiae sit facta promissio, dum ait Jesus: *Et ego dico tibi, Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram aedificabo Ecclesiam meam, et portae inferorum non praevalebunt adversus eam; et dabo tibi claves regni coelorum, quidquid liga veris in terra, ligatum erit in coelis*. Neque alter, Joh. 21, 15. ubi promissionis ante factae sit praestatio, dum Simoni Petro inquit, *Simon fili Jonae, diligis me plus quam hi? Dicit ei Petrus, Certe Domine tu nosti, quod amem te. Dicit ipsi: Pasce agnos meos. Dicit rursum secundo, Simon Jonae, diligis me? Certe Domine tu nosti quod amem te. Dicit ei: Pasce oves meas. Dicit ei tertio, Simon fili Jonae, amas me? Tristitia fuit affectus Petrus, quod tertio dixisset ipsi, amas me? Dixit ei, Domine, tu omnia nosti, tu nosti quod amem te. Dicit ei Jesus, Pasce oves meas*.

XXI Equidem ad priorem locum quod attinet, ut Christus interrogat communiter omnes Discipulos, quid homines de se dicerent: ita et responderunt omnes, vers. 15. (forte unus aliorum nomine). Utque exquiritur communis* ipsorum a Christo de se sententia: ita Petrus respondet pro reliquis ex eorum omnium sensu, aut saltem assensu, quod ex responso ipso apparet: *Tu es Christus*, ut est apud Marc. 8, 29. vel, *Tu es Christus Dei*, Luc. 9, 20. vel, ut hic, *Tu es Christus Filius Dei vivi*. Cui accedit etiam prohibitio omnibus discipulis post facta, ut nemini dicerent, se esse Jesum illum Christum. Unde communis* consensus evincitur.

XXII Et sane utrumque, *Jesum esse Christum*, et *Filium Dei vivi*, omnes Apostoli et Discipuli de Christo antehac habuerunt persuasissimum. Talem eum Johannes Baptista agnovit, Joh. 1, 29. et talem se testatus est suis discipulis, vers. 34. 35. Inter quos Andreas frater Petri, qui illud Simoni Petro renunciavit, vers. 41. ut

Antioch (Acts 8:14), and he renders an account* of his task (Acts 11:2). In fact, Paul reprimands him for not walking uprightly, and he opposes him to his face (Galatians 2:11, etc.). In no way was Peter placed over the others as their head, nor were the others subject to his leadership and direction.

19 And yet we do admit that the apostles occupied a primary position on the level of their administration, in keeping with their special calling and the extraordinary assistance of the Holy Spirit, so that also for the sake of good order (*eutaxia*) did Peter occasionally take the lead among them. But we deny that he therefore exercised or held sovereignty over them or over the universal Church. But this entire primacy is not one of degree among lesser people, but of order among equals, and of authority, not jurisdiction.

20 Nor does the passage in Matthew 16[:18–19] do anything to support this case, where the promise of this primacy and preeminence is made to Peter, when Jesus says: "And I say to you, you are Peter, and on this rock I shall build my Church, and the gates of hell will not prevail against it; and I shall give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven." Nor does the other passage, John 21:15, where the promise that had been made previously is conveyed, when he says to Simon Peter: "'Simon, son of John, do you love me more than these?' And Peter says to him: 'Yes, Lord, you know that I love you.' He says to him: 'Feed my sheep.' Again, a second time he says to him: 'Simon son of John, do you love me?' 'Yes, Lord, you know that I love you.' He says to him: 'Feed my sheep.' He says to him a third time, 'Simon son of John, do you love me?' Peter was moved to sorrow because the third time he said to him, 'do you love me?' He said to him: 'Lord, you know everything. You know that I love you.' Jesus says to him: 'Feed my sheep.'"

21 And as far as the first passage is concerned, as it is in general to all the disciples that Christ asks the question what men are saying about him (verse 15), so too do they all reply (incidentally, one on behalf of the others). And just as it is their shared* opinion about the Christ that is asked, so too is it on behalf of the others and on the basis of the thinking of them all (or at least with their consent) that Peter answers, as is clear from the answer itself: "You are the Christ," as in Mark 8:29; or, as in Luke 9:20: "You are the Christ of God;" or, as it is in the passage here [Matthew 16:16]: "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God." And added to this is also the prohibition made afterwards to all the disciples that they should tell no-one that he is Jesus, the Christ. This clearly demonstrates that there was a common* consensus.

22 And it is obvious that prior to this time all the apostles and disciples were fully convinced that Jesus is both the Christ and the Son of the living God. John the Baptist acknowledges him as such (John 1:29), and Christ bore witness of himself as such to his own disciples (verses 34–35). And among the disciples

Philippus Nathanaeli, v. 45. et Nathanael, *Tu es Filius ille Dei, tu es Rex Israël*, v. 49. Johannis discipulis ad se eo nomine missis, confirmavit Christus, Matt. 11, 3. Professi sunt discipuli Christi, Matt. 14, 33. Quinimo et Samaritana, Joh. 4. et Samaritani, 29. 42. Caeci illi, Matt. 9, 27. Syrophoenissa, Matt. 15, 22. etc. nedum Apostoli, imo idem Petrus antea ceterorum nomine similiter professus est, Joh. 6, 68. 69. *Nos credimus et scimus te esse Christum Filium Dei viventis*.

XXIII Unde et ea quae Petro, ut omnium voci, deinceps singulariter accommodantur, sub persona* et in figura ejus, communiter et aeque de reliquis intelligenda sunt, utpote *beatitudinis illius*, ob praeclaram hanc confessionem ab eo editam, *praedicatio*, ejusque in revelatione divina, *causa*, Luc. 10, 21. 22. 23. Matt. 11, 27. Gal. 1, 12. 16. *Recognitio quoque nominis Cephae*, quod petram notat, ei singulariter ante editi, Joh. 1, 42. Marc. 3, 16. et jam ob fundamentalem fidei summam ab eo editam confirmati, ratione scilicet prioris illius impositionis reddita, dum ait, *Et ego*, id est, vicissim dico, id est profiteor tibi, *Quod tu es Petrus*, scilicet nomine et re,* firmitatis fidei et confessionis ratione habita, in quo ita ipsius ut reliquorum commendatio est: qui similiter respectu doctrinae, ejusque professionis et administrationis, preciosorum lapidum nominibus insigniuntur, Esai. 54, 11. *Ecce ego collocaturus sum cum ornamento lapides tuos, et fundaturus sapphiris*. Sic et Apoc. 21, 14. 19.

XXIV Quin et *promissio ei facta de aedificanda super hanc petram Ecclesia sua*. Quod non de Petro personaliter,* sed de fidei ejus Christum intuentis professione realiter intelligendum est; non enim dicit, super te Petrum, sed super hanc petram, commutato Petri nomine in petrae, masculino in femininum, et persona secunda in tertiam, et addito pronomine demonstrativo; et in Syro articulus, qui tantum appellativis additur, voci* Cephae hic praepositus, idem

Andrew, the brother of Peter, confirmed this fact to Simon Peter (verse 41), as Philip did to Nathanael (verse 45), and Nathanael confirmed: "You are the Son of God, you are the King of Israel" (verse 49). And when the disciples of John were sent on his behalf to him, Christ confirmed it (Matthew 11:3). The disciples of Christ confessed it in Matthew 14:33, and in fact so also the Samaritan woman (John 4:29), and the Samaritans (John 4:42), the blind men (Matthew 9:27), the Syro-Phoenician woman (Matthew 15:22), not to mention the apostles and also the same Peter who professed it earlier on behalf of the others (John 6:68–69): "We believe and know that you are the Christ, the Son of the living God."

23 And for this reason also the statements that throughout are applied specifically to Peter, as the spokesman of them all, should be understood as referring commonly and equally to the other disciples as included in the person* and role of Peter, as for example, his blessedness, his very open confession, his preaching, and his role in God's revelation (Luke 10:21–23; Matthew 11:27; Galatians 1:12, 16). So also for the recognition of the name Cephas, which means rock, that previously had been bestowed upon him in particular (John 1:42; Mark 3:16) and that now is re-affirmed because of the fundamental statement of confirmed faith that he expressed—i.e., by the explanation that is given of that earlier naming—when he says: "And I (that is, and I say in reply, i.e., I declare to you) that you are Peter," that is, both in name and in fact,* considered by virtue of the strength of your faith and confession, which [name] includes a recommendation of his own and the others' faith. For in the same way with respect to doctrine and to the profession and administration of it they are (all) indicated by the names of precious stones: "Behold I am going to set your stones with ornaments and I shall lay the foundation with sapphires" (Isaiah 54:11); so also Revelation 21:14–19.

24 And the same goes for the promise that Christ made to him about building his Church on this rock. For we should take that word to mean not Peter personally,* but in the real sense for the profession of the faith of him who looks to Christ.[12] For Christ does not say "upon you, Peter (*Petrus*)" but "upon this rock" (*petra*), by changing the name of Peter to "rock," from masculine to feminine, and from the second person into the third, and with the addition of the demonstrative pronoun. And in Aramaic, the [definite] article that is added only to appellative nouns, and here is put before the word* Cephas,

12 For the exegetical discussions in the context of the controversy on the primacy of Peter; see John E. Bigane, *Faith, Christ, or Peter: Matthew 16:18 in Sixteenth-Century Roman Catholic Exegesis* (Washington: University Press of America, 1981), and Stephen K. Ray, *Upon This Rock: St. Peter and the Primacy of Rome in Scripture and the Early Church* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1999).

indicat. Neque *Ecclesiae aedificatio super personam** ullius hominis, sed solius Christi, qui est unica illa Petra, 1 Cor. 3. et 1 Cor. 10. doctrinamque de eo editam, facta est. Quo sensu et id reliquis Apostolis, ut architectis aedificii Dei, 1 Cor. 3. et ipsorum insuper doctrinae communiter tribuitur. Eph. 2. Apoc. 21. et fides fidelium fundamentum dicitur, cui ipsi superstructi, Judae vers. 20.

XXV Ad haec *promissio* de petrae illius fundamentalis, et Ecclesiae ei inaedificandae firmitate; *Et portae inferorum non praevalebunt adversus eam*. Quod *de Petro* per se intelligi nequit, ut cujus fides et mores aliquando vacillarunt, Matt. 16, 22. 23. et 26, 33. 34. Luc. 22, 31. 34. Gal. 2, 12. etc. Sed de *fide ab eo edita*, quae firma et immota manet, si ipsam professionem, non simpliciter profitentem spectes. Neque de Ecclesia qualibet, sed de Ecclesia Catholica, quae est columna et firmamentum veritatis.

XXVI Denique *promissio ei facta de clavibus regni coelorum*, at non inquit, *Et tibi dabo soli claves regni coelorum*, quibus metaphorice administrationis potestas in Ecclesia Dei significatur,* ejusque ratio* altera metaphora indicatur, et *quicquid ligaveris in terra, ligatum erit in coelis, et quicquid solveris in terra, erit solutum in coelis*, quod fit, tum *praedicatione Evangelii*, privatim in conscientia cujusque, Matt. 28, 18. 19. Marc. 16, 16. tum *publice usu disciplinae et excommunicatione*, Matt. 18, 15. 17. 18. Quae gubernationis potestas non est absoluta,* sed ministerialis et promulgatoria, pro ratione fidei et resipiscentiae cujusque. Ac

indicates the same thing.[13] And the building-up of the Church is not based on the person* of any one man, but upon Christ only, who is the one and only Rock (1 Corinthians 3[:11], and 1 Corinthians 10[:4]), and on the teaching that he had proclaimed. In this sense the building-up is applied commonly also to the other apostles as the builders of God's house (1 Corinthians 3), and to their teaching (Ephesians 2; Revelation 21); and the faith of the believers is called the foundation upon which they are built (Jude 20).

Added to this is the promise of the firm quality of that foundational rock, 25
and of the Church that is to be built upon it: "And the gates of hell shall not prevail against her." That text cannot be taken to mean Peter *per se* since his faith and moral conduct sometimes wavered (Matthew 16:22–23, and 26:33–34; Luke 22:31–34; Galatians 2:12, etc.); but it is about the faith that he declared, and that is what remains firm and unshaken if one looks to the actual profession and not merely to the one who professes. Nor can it be taken as being about any church whatsoever, but only about the catholic Church that is the pillar and bulwark of truth.

And lastly, there is the promise made to him about the keys to the kingdom 26
of heaven; [Christ] does not say: "And only to you shall I give the keys," which metaphorically signify* the sovereignty of administering God's Church. The reason* for that metaphor is revealed by another one: "And whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven." And this takes place by both the preaching of the Gospel (privately, to everyone's conscience, Matthew 28:18–19, Mark 16:16, as well as publicly, by the use of discipline and excommunication, Matthew 18:15, 17, 18). This sovereignty of governing is not an absolute* one, but is administrative

13 The argument here may refer to the Syriac version of the Gospel of Matthew, which indeed has the word Kepha for "rock." In 1569, Immanuel Tremellius published a polyglot Bible together with Theodore Beza, in which the Syriac Peshitta of the New Testament was included. This edition, the *Hē Kainē Diathēkē = Testamentum Novum = Diatiqa chadata: est autem interpretatio Syriaca Novi Testamenti, Hebraeis typis descripta, plerisque etiam locis emendata: eadem Latino sermone reddita* (Geneva: Estienne, 1569) is presently available at the library of Leiden university, and was probably consulted by Thysius. Tremellius based his version on the edition published by Johannes Albertus Widmanstadt and the Syrian monk Moses Mardenus: *Liber sacrosancti Evangelii de Iesu Christo Domino et Deo nostro* (Vienna: Zimmermann, 1555). Apart from the exact literary reference, the line of reasoning is as follows: in the Syriac or Aramaic version, the word "Kepha" with a definite article is an appellative noun denoting a class of objects, not a proper name. Therefore the "rock" on which the Church is built should not be understood as Peter personally, but as something about him, namely his confession to Christ as the Son of God. The argument seems to be misguided, however, as the Syriac text does contain a demonstrative pronoun, but no definite article.

ea quidem Ecclesiae est, Matt. 18, 18. specialiter vero, ut omnibus Apostolis hic promittitur, ita post committitur, Joh. 20, 21. 22. 23. Matt. 28, 18. a commissione autem ad promissionem ante factam valet argumentum.

XXVII Ad locum vero alterum Joh. 21. quod attinet, non tribuitur eo ipso Simoni Petro *universale pastoris munus* in totam Ecclesiam, reliquosque Apostolos, sed commune* pascendi cum reliquis officium, Matt. 18. ex quo merito trina abnegatione exciderat, Matt. 10, 32. terna opposita confessione restituitur, quod et dolor arguit, quem concepit Petrus ex tertiata interrogatione, quasi dubitantis Christi hic sermo* esset; neque βόσκε et ποίμαινε, pasce τὰ ἀρνία, *agnos* meos, atque τὰ πρόβατα, *oves* meas, diversam notionem habent. Neque pascere, imperium notat, sed ministerium. Alienas enim oves jubetur pascere. Neque dicitur, πάντα τὰ πρόβατα, sed indefinite etiam aliis commissa, Matt. 28, 19. Marc. 16, 15. 2 Cor. 11, 28. Neque denique omnes Ecclesias pavit, sed partito cum reliquis egit, Gal. 2.

XXVIII Neque quicquam in adversum facit, quod quaerit ex eo Christus, *amas me plus, quam hi*, scilicet Apostoli praesentes, Thomas videlicet et duo filii Zebedaei, etc. quasi ab excessu amoris ipsius prae reliquis, concluderetur super reliquos principatus. Neque ea interrogatione Christi, constat eum plus reliquis amasse, imo contra, quod quaestio institueretur de re, ad quam respondere nequibat (unde non de alieno, sed de suo amore testatus est ipse) constat, non id affirmantis, sed ejus confidentem ambitionem, ut qui dixerat, *etiamsi omnes offendantur in te, ego nunquam offendar*, Matt. 26, 35. exprobrantis et arguentis esse. Ac tantum eo indicatur, quam magna fidei et caritatis perfectio* ab omnibus ministris Ecclesiae exigatur.

XXIX Multo minus *Pontifici Romano, successionis et haereditatis* (ut volunt) *jure*, haec ipsa competit in Ecclesiam Dei et Christi reliquosque Episcopos potestas, et administrationis primatus. Id enim multa praesupponit, 1. Petrum reliquis Apostolis fuisse constitutum superiorem, quod secus esse jam probavimus.* 2. Jus illud superioritatis in eo non fuisse personale,* sed successivum. At Apostolis nemo, quod singularis eorum sit vocatio, succedit; et si succeditur, in doctrina et communi* officio succeditur. 3. Successionem illam alligatam fuisse

and promulgatory, in keeping with each person's faith and repentance. And it does indeed belong to the Church (Matthew 18:18), yet in the special sense of being promised there to all the apostles and thus later being entrusted to them (John 20:21–23; Matthew 28:18); but the strength of the argument resides in the commission of the previously-made promise.

As far as the second passage, John 21, is concerned, by that particular passage 27
Simon Peter is not given a universal office over the whole Church and over the other apostles, but the duty of shepherding together* with the others (Matthew 18). Peter deservedly had been removed from that duty because of his triple denial (Matthew 10:32), and he is restored to it by his triple, opposite profession. This is proved also by the grief that Peter felt after he was asked for a third time (as though Christ's speech* showed doubt). Nor do the words *boske* and *poimaine*—[that can be translated as] "feed my lambs" (*ta arnia*), and "my sheep" (*ta probata*)—have a different meaning. And "to feed" does not denote rule but ministry. For Peter is commanded to feed the sheep that belong to someone else. And it does not say "all of my sheep," but without restriction sheep are entrusted also to others (Matthew 28:19; Mark 16:15; 2 Corinthians 11:28). And lastly, Peter did not tend all the churches, but he divided the work with the others (Galatians 2).

And this is not contradicted at all by the fact that Christ asks him "do you 28
love me more than these?"—i.e., these apostles who were present (namely Thomas and the two sons of Zebedee), as if on the basis of Peter's love that surpassed the others' one may conclude his primacy over the others. And Christ's question does not prove that Peter had a greater love than the others, but something quite different, because he was being asked a question that he was not in a position to answer (and for this reason he testified not about someone else's love but about his own). Christ's question proves that it was not one of confirmation but one of reproof, and of demonstrating Peter's self-confident ambition, for he had said: "Even if they all take offense at you, I shall never take offense" (Matthew 26:35). [The question] only shows how great a perfection* of faith and love is required of all those who minister in the Church.

And much less does this sovereignty over the Church of God and Christ, 29
and over the other overseers, and the primacy of administration apply to the Romanist pope by the right (as they would have it) of succession and inheritance. For that presupposes many things: 1) That Peter was set up as superior to the other apostles (which we have just shown* is wrong). 2) That the right of superiority in him was not personal* in nature, but one of succession. But there is no-one who has succeeded the apostle, because their calling was unique, and if there is succession, it is a succession of doctrine and common* calling. 3) That this succession was bound to a specific place and seat of power.

certo loco et cathedrae. At locus successionem non confert. 4. Sedem illam postremam fuisse quam postremo tenuit. 5. Eam Hierosolymis (unde verbum* prodituram Evangelii diserte dicitur, Esai. 2. et Christus consummatus est) translatam in Antiochiam, (ubi primi Christiani appellati sunt) inde demum Romam, ubi non modo fuerit et vixerit multos annos, sed et martyrio consummatus sit. Adeo ut is, qui illi ibidem quocunque modo successerit, licet fide et dilectione impar reliquis, etiam in privilegium et jus Petri successerit. At Paulus quamvis scribat Romanis, et Romae epistolas ad Galatas, Ephes. Philip. Timoth. Philem. nusquam Petri in salutationibus suis meminit. Quae omnes hypotheses divinis testimoniis,* quibus fides nititur, probandae* erant. At nihil minus possunt, sed ad traditionem eamque incertam, hic confugere necesse habent.[a] Imo vero omnis qua fruitur praerogativa Pontifex Romanus, humani potius et imperatorii, puta Phocae impii et Regicidae Imperatoris, est instituti.

xxx Imo vero Episcopus et Papa Romanus, dum se *universae Ecclesiae Dei et Christi, Dominum, Regem, Monarcham, Sponsum et Maritum, Caput et Fundamentum*, itemque *vicarium Dei in his terris, et universalem Episcopum*, seu *Episcopum Episcoporum* vocare, et pro iis se gerere non veretur; idque cum

[a] habent; cui fides nostra inniti non potest: 1642.

But succession is not conferred by place. 4) That that seat was the last one that he occupied at the end. 5) That the seat was moved from Jerusalem (from where it states clearly that the word* of the Gospel would go forth, Isaiah 2, and where the fulfillment of Christ was) to Antioch (where Christians were first so called), and thence to Rome, where Peter not only was and lived for many years, but where he also completed his martyrdom. So much so that whoever it is who succeeds Peter, and in whatever way he succeeds him, even if he is not like the others in faith and love, nevertheless he does succeed to Peter's privileged position and right. But as for Paul, even though he is writing to people at Rome, and even though it is from Rome that he writes his letters to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Timothy, and Philemon, nowhere in the opening words of greeting does he make mention of Peter. All these assumptions should be proved* by the sacred testimonies* on which the faith rests. But they can do nothing of the sort, instead deeming it necessary on this point to take recourse in tradition (and a doubtful one at that).[14] In fact, every privilege that the Roman high priest enjoys is based much more on a human and imperatorial institution—namely that of Phocas, the godless, regicidal emperor.[15]

But in fact the Roman bishop and pope, when he is not afraid to call himself 30
the lord of the universal Church of God and Christ, and its lord, king, monarch, spouse and husband, head and foundation, and also the vicar of God on this earth, and the world-wide bishop or bishop of bishops,[16] and is not afraid to

14 See also *SPT* 4, "On the Perfection of Scripture, and the Futility of Adding Unwritten Traditions to it." In 1642 the following phrase is added: "… whereon it is not possible for our faith to rest."

15 Phocas (547–610) was Byzantine Emperor from 602 to 610, after usurping the throne from Maurice. He was reportedly one of the most malign of all Byzantine emperors. He enjoyed good relations with Rome, his recognition of the primacy of the pope in matters of religion winning him praise from Pope Gregory the Great. In 604 he wrote to Gregory's successor Boniface III, transferring the title "Head of all the Churches" or "Universal Bishop" from Constantinople to Rome. Calvin also refers to this act in *Institutes*, 4.7.17, adding that Gregory would never have agreed.

16 Some of these designations occur in the "Decree for the Greeks" issued at the Council of Florence in 1439 (DH 1300–1308, in particular 1307). There it is stated that "that the holy Apostolic See, and the Roman Pontiff, hold the primacy throughout the entire world; and that the Roman Pontiff himself is the successor of blessed Peter, the chief of the Apostles, and the true vicar of Christ, and that he is the head of the entire Church, and the father and teacher of all Christians; and that full power was given to him in blessed Peter by our Lord Jesus Christ, to feed, rule, and govern the universal Church." A full list of fifteen titles for the bishop of Rome is provided by Bellarmine, *Disputationes*, controversy 3, "De summo Pontifice," book 2, chapter 31 (*Opera* 1:611–615): "Father, Father of Fathers, Christian Pontiff, High Priest, Prince of Priests, Vicar of Christ, Head of the body of the Church, Foundation of the building of the Church, Pastor of the Lord's sheep, Father and Teacher of all believers,

salutis necessitate* credendum asserit; Antichristum illum se revera esse eo ipso demonstrat,* ut qui summam potestatem, Christo reipsa propriam invadit, ejusque se consortem facit, Ecclesiae Dei et conservis suis se praefert: quem in templo Dei sessurum, et se elaturum super omne quod dicitur Deus aut numen, Apostolus praedicit, 2. Thess. 2.

XXXI Equidem dum se *Herum, Dominum, Principem, Regem, Monarcham Ecclesiae* dicit, absolute* quidem, quoad spiritualia, in temporalibus vero universim, idque cum respectu, quatenus ea ad spiritualia ordinata sunt, ac ea, quae Domini ac Regis sunt, agit, ut dum ceu legislator interpretandi divina potestatem sibi infallibilem arrogat, de divinis dispensat, eaque abrogat, leges obligantes conscientiam ipsi fert, tantundem est, ac si quis minister aut servus, aut etiam legatus se Dominum ac Regem faceret, aut quae Domini sunt, sibi arrogaret. Quod est contraria nectere, et laesae Majestatis divinae crimen committere.

XXXII Et sane nusquam hic titulus in Scriptura *ministris Dei* tribuitur. Imo vero Christus Rex immediatus* Ecclesiae est, quod primitus adumbratum fuit in Regno Israëlis; ubi Deus immediatus Rex populi esse voluit, donec visibilem Regem petentes, Deum ipsum dicuntur rejecisse, et Deus illis Regem dedisse in ira sua. Complementum vero accepit in Romana Ecclesia et Pontifice Romano.

XXXIII *Sponsum et maritum* dum sese Ecclesiae facit, quid aliud quam Ecclesiam adulteram, et sese adulterum facit? Nullus hic Vicarii est locus. *Qui habet Sponsam*, inquit Johannes Baptistes, *Sponsus est, amicus vero Sponsi qui stat et audit eum, gaudio gaudet propter vocem Sponsi*, Joh. 3, 19. Paulus similiter est is,

---

Ruler of the house of God, Guard of the Lord's vineyard, Spouse of the Church, Patron of the Apostolic See, Universal Bishop."

conduct himself by those designations, and when he claims that one must* believe it in order to be saved, he then actually shows* by that very act that he is really the Antichrist, as one who makes an attack upon the supreme sovereignty that actually belongs to Christ, and makes himself out to be his consort and exalts himself above the Church of God and his own fellow-servants. The apostle foretells in 2 Thessalonians 2[:4] that he would take his seat in God's temple and would raise himself over all that is called God or the object of worship.

31 And when he calls himself master, lord, ruler, king, and monarch of the Church,[17] he means it in an absolute* sense as far as spiritual matters are concerned (but in a universal sense in temporal matters, and insofar as these temporal matters are adjusted to spiritual ones). And he performs those things that belong to a Lord and king, such as when like a lawgiver he appropriates for himself the infallible power of interpreting divine matters, and dispenses or abrogates divine matters, and introduces to the church laws that are binding upon the conscience,[18] just as much as if some servant or slave, or even an envoy makes himself lord and king, or claims for himself what belongs to the Lord. To do so is to bind opposites together, and to commit a crime of injury to the majesty of God.

32 To be sure, nowhere in Scripture is this title given to God's servants. But it is Christ who is the Church's immediate* King, a fact that was foreshadowed first in the kingdom of Israel, when it was God's will to be the immediate King of his people, until, it says, they sought to have a king whom they could behold with their eyes and they rejected God himself, and that it was in his anger that God gave them a king. And this kingship truly received its fulfillment in the Roman church and the Roman high priest.

33 And when [the pope] makes himself out to be the spouse and husband of the Church,[19] what else is he doing but making the Church into an adulteress and himself into an adulterer? On this point there is no place for a substitute. John the Baptist says: "He who has a bride is a bridegroom; the true friend of the bridegroom is the one who stands and hears him, who rejoices greatly because

17 On the 'monarchy' of the pope see Bellarmine, "De summo Pontifice," 1.9–10 (*Opera* 1:479–493).

18 That the pope has the authority to bind the consciences of the believers is defended by Bellarmine, "De summo Pontifice," 4.15–16 (*Opera* 2:120–129).

19 For this designation Bellarmine (*Opera* 1:613a) refers to the (second) Council of Lyons of 1274. In his papal bull "Ubi periculum," pope Gregory X employed the title "Spouse of the Church." It is also found in Thomas Aquinas, *Contra impugnantes* (1252–1256), part 2, chapter 3, section 6, ad 22.

qui praeparat eam tamquam virginem puram, uni viro Christo sistendam, 2 Cor. 11. 2. Suffecit ergo eis esse paranymphis. Neque hic titulus usquam in sacris literis Ecclesiae administris assignatur. Quem palliare similitudine imaginarii concubitus, inter magnates usitati, ineptum est; fuerit enim ita sane Papa tantum imaginarius Ecclesiae Sponsus.

XXXIV *Caput Ecclesiae universale* dum se esse affirmat, πολυκέφαλον Ecclesiam statuit (at unius corporis unum est caput ejusdem ordinis) adeoque monstrosum corpus constituit. Neque distinctione capitis sub capite, aut visibilis Ecclesiae visibilis capitis, monstrum in hoc corpore evitatur. Non enim haec visibilis et invisibilis Ecclesiae distinctio essentialis,* sed ei accidentalis* est. Quin quae proportio hujus visibilis capitis ad totum Ecclesiae corpus? et quomodo una haec persona* universam Ecclesiam curare potuerit? Unde et partito egerunt Apostoli.

XXXV Nusquam etiam haec appellatio capitis Ecclesiae, ministris Ecclesiae tribuitur. Sacerdotes enim capita populi, non nisi communi* magistratus, optimatum et honorabilium notione dicuntur, Esa. 9, 14. 15. Os. 5, 1. Summus Sacerdos insuper typice ad Christum, cujus in eo complementum est. Etiamsi autem in Ecclesiae Christi administratione praestantiora ejus membra sub capitis nomine forte veniant, 1 Cor. 12, 21. (ubi tamen capitis dignitas de Christo dicitur, vers. 12. et 27.) non tamen una aliqua persona,* sed officia ac dona potiora ea appellatione designantur, ut apparet ex filo totius capitis, aut intelligendum de constitutione corporis mystici.

XXXVI *Fundamentum* porro *Ecclesiae Catholicae* dum sese jactitat, quamvis fundamentum in fundamento et secundarium fundamentum dicat, quid aliud quam nugas agit, contradictoria in adjecto nectens. Non enim proprie* fundamentum quicquam est, quam unum, et cui reliqua moles inaedificatur, quod solus Christus est, 1 Cor. 3, 11.

XXXVII Quod vero duodecim fundamenta coelestis Jerusalem dicuntur, quibus inscripta sunt nomina 12. Apostolorum, intelligendum est vocabulum fundamen-

of the bridegroom's voice" (John 3:29). And in a similar way it is Paul "who prepares her [the church] as a pure virgin to be presented to one husband, Christ" (2 Corinthians 11:2). Therefore it is enough for them to be the groom's "best men." And not even this title is given to the servants of the Church anywhere in the Scriptures. And it is foolish to cover this up with a comparison to the pretended sexual consummation that is customary among important personages, for then the pope would thus be the Church's pretended spouse.[20]

34 And when he makes the claim that he is the universal head of the Church, he causes the Church to be multi-headed (but for one body there is only one head of the same order) and thus he turns the body into a monstrosity. And the monster in this body is not avoided by a distinction of a head below another head, or of a visible head of a visible church. For this distinction of a visible and invisible Church is not an essential* one but it is only accidental* to it. For what is the proportion of this visible head to the whole body of the Church? And how shall this one person* be able to care for the world-wide Church? And that was the reason why the apostles arranged to work separately.

35 And this name of the head of the Church is not even given to the ministers of the Church. For the priests are not called the heads of the people except in the common* sense of the magistracy, of the leaders, and of honored people (Isaiah 9:14–15, Hosea 5:1). What is more, not even the high-priest, being the type of Christ in whom he is fulfilled, is so called. For even if in administering the Church of Christ its more outstanding members might go with the name "head" (1 Corinthians 12:21; where nevertheless the dignity of the head is said about Christ, verse 12 and 27). Yet that naming does not designate any one person,* but the more powerful office and the gifts, as is clear from the thread of the whole chapter, or else it must be understood as being about the composition of the mystical body.

36 And moreover, although he calls it a foundation upon another foundation and a secondary foundation, when he makes the claim that he himself is the foundation of the catholic Church, what else is he doing but trifling, connecting contradictory elements by adding something? For strictly* speaking not any foundation exists other than the one and only, and upon it the rest of the structure is built—and that foundation is Christ alone (1 Corinthians 3:11).

37 And as for the fact that mention is made of twelve foundations for the heavenly Jerusalem, and that inscribed upon them are the names of the twelve

20 Bellarmine (*Opera* 1:613a) responds to a critical note by Bernard of Clairvaux (*Epistle* 237) that it is not appropriate for the vice-regent to sleep with the king's bride.

torum secundum extensionem seu distributionem partium unius ejusdemque fundamenti. Sic fundamentum et fundamenta templi dicuntur, 1 Reg. 5, 17. et 2 Chron. 3, 3. Hebr. 11, 10. Ita revera unum idemque Ecclesiae fundamentum, secundum ejusdem in particularibus Ecclesiis repositionem, fundamenta appellantur, atque in iis inscripta nomina Apostolorum, ut qui singuli secundum partes Ecclesiarum, eorum, ut architecti, positores fuerunt. Sic civitatis hujus 12. portae assignantur, et in iis 12. Angeli ut custodes, et inscripta nomina 12. Patriarcharum. Cum autem una sit porta illius, nempe Christus, Joh. 10. similiter ad Eph. 2, 20. Ecclesia aedificata dicitur super fundamentum Apostolorum et Prophetarum, scilicet quod illi posuerunt. Quo sensu Apostolus alienum fundamentum suo opponit, Rom. 15, 20. vel metonymice super doctrina ab illis annunciata, Hebr. 6, 2.

XXXVIII *Vicarium* porro *Dei* et *Christi universalem in terris*, dum prae se fert, quid aliud, quam origine quidem, non tamen sapientia et potentia* ac potestate se diversum a Christo facit? Utrumque autem sibi arrogat, dum jactitat se habere omnia jura in scrinio pectoris sui, errare non posse,* et agere ex plenitudine potestatis. At vero hoc vicario opus non est, cum Deus in Christo, per Spiritum Sanctum semper et ubique Ecclesiae suae praesens adsit. At absentis vicarius est.

XXXIX *Pastorem* denique *Pastorum, Episcopum Episcoporum, et Oecumenicum Episcopum, et Patrem Patrum*, dum se asseverat, nihil aliud, quam ambitione ac insigni superbia sua Antichristum sese exhibet. Episcopus nusquam nisi respectu Ecclesiae, non etiam aliorum Episcoporum, usurpatur in Sacris, Act. 20, 28. Neque hujus muneris inter munera Ecclesiastica fit mentio, 1 Cor. 12, 28. Rom. 12, 8. Eph. 4, 11. 1 Tim. 3. Quod fieri debuisset in re,* quam faciunt fidei. Quin si quis oecumenicum Episcopum se dicit, non modo dominatur in clerum, 1 Pet. 5, 3. sed et in conservos et sympresbyteros tyrannum agit, contra mandatum Christi, disceptantibus discipulis, quis ipsorum major esset, ter repetitum, videlicet in itinere Capernaum versus. Matt. 18, 1. Marc. 9, 33. Luc. 9, 46. prope Jericho, Matt. 20, 21. Marc. 10, 35. Hierosolymis in sacra Coena, Luc. 22, 24. Ac eo Diotrephen φιλοπρωτεύοντα aemulatur. Quod autem dicitur Matt. 20. et Luc. 22. Vos non sic, ibi vos non sic, non dominationis modum,*

apostles, we should—by the extension or distribution of its parts—take the word "foundations" to mean the one, same foundation. In the same way there is spoken of the foundation as well as the foundations of the temple (1 Kings 5:17; 2 Chronicles 3:3; Hebrews 11:10). And so actually the one and the same foundation of the Church goes by the name of foundations in keeping with it being located in individual churches; and the names of the apostles are written upon them as they were (in terms of the churches' parts) individually their builders and founders. In the same way this city is given twelve gates, and the names of the twelve angels, its watchmen, are written upon them, and also the names of the twelve patriarchs. Even so that city has but one gate, and that is Christ (John 10[:9]; similarly Ephesians 2:20). It says that the Church is built upon the foundation of the apostles and the prophets, namely on what they have founded, and in this sense the apostle opposes his own foundation to one that was made by someone else (Romans 15:20), or, as a metonym, one that was built upon doctrine taught by those others (Hebrews 6:2).

38 And when he puts himself forward as God's and Christ's universal deputy on earth, what else is he doing but distinguishing himself from Christ at the point of origin, but not of his wisdom, power,* and sovereignty? But he does appropriate both for himself when he boasts that he possesses every right within the shrine of his heart, that he is not capable* of erring, and that his actions come from the fullness of power. But in fact there is no need for such a deputy, since God in Christ and through the Holy Spirit is always and everywhere present to aid his Church. But a deputy takes the place of someone who is absent.

39 And lastly, when he makes the claim that he is the chief shepherd, the great or world-wide bishop, and the father of fathers, he is doing nothing else than demonstrating by his ambition and excessive pride that he is the Antichrist. In the sacred writings "bishop" is used nowhere except with respect to the Church, and certainly not of other bishops (Acts 20:28). And no mention is made of this office among the other offices of the Church (1 Corinthians 12:28; Romans 12:8; Ephesians 4:11; 1 Timothy 3). But this should have been mentioned in a matter* that they make into a matter of faith. But anyone who calls himself world-wide bishop not only is lording over the inheritance (1 Peter 5:3) but also is being a tyrant to his fellow servants and fellow overseers. This is contrary to what Christ commanded when the disciples were disputing who of them was the greatest, on three occasions (on the road to Capernaum, Matthew 18:1; Mark 9:33; Luke 9:46; near Jericho, Matthew 20:21; Mark 10:35; in Jerusalem at the holy supper, Luke 22:24). And in so doing the pope is emulating Diotrephes, who desired to be foremost [3 John: 9–11]. But in Matthew 20[:26] and Luke 22[:26] it says "not so you" and "but you are not like that;" this does not mean the mode* of the

ut Bellarminus[a] vult, sed rem ipsam notat, qualiter Ps. 1. *Non sic impii*, et Ps. 147. *Non sic facit omni nationi*, id est, non id.

XL Ex quibus utique apparet, *Pontificem et Papam Romanum* revera *Antichristum* et filium perditionis, *Romanam vero Ecclesiam, Papanam et Antichristianam esse*. Cujus pleniorem demonstrationem, ob materiae amplitudinem, in aliam disputationem rejicimus.

Augustinus, *Serm. 13, de verbis Domini secundum Matth.*[b]

Tu es ergo, inquit, Petrus, et super hanc Petram, *quam cognovisti dicens*, Tu es Christus Filius Dei vivi, aedificabo Ecclesiam meam, *super me aedificabo te, non me super te*.

Idem, *Tractatu in Joh. 124*.[c]

Super hanc, *inquit*, Petram aedificabo Ecclesiam meam. *Petra enim erat Christus, super quod fundamentum etiam ipse aedificatus est Petrus. Fundamentum quippe aliud nemo potest ponere praeter id, quod positum est Christus Jesus*.

Idem *in Joh. Tract*. 118.[d]

Quum essent interrogati omnes, solus Petrus respondet, Tu es Christus, *et ei dicitur*, tibi dabo claves, *quasi ligandi et solvendi solus acceperit potestatem, quum et unus pro omnibus dixerit, et hoc cum omnibus, tamquam personam gerens ipsius unitatis acceperit. Ideo unus pro omnibus, quia unitas in omnibus*.

---

[a] Bellarmine, *De Sumo Pontifice* 5.10 (*Opera* 2:165). [b] Augustine, *Sermo LXXVI* 1.1 (MPL 38:479). [c] Augustine, *In evangelium Ioannis tractatus CXXIV* 124.5 (CCSL 36:684–685). [d] Augustine, *In evangelium Ioannis tractatus CXXIV* 118.4 (CCSL 36:656–657).

lordship (as Bellarmine would have it)[21] but the actual lordship itself, just as in Psalm 1[:4] "the ungodly are not so" and Psalm 147[:20] "but he does not do so for every nation," i.e., he does not do that.

These things make it altogether evident that the Roman high priest and 40
pope is in fact the Antichrist and the son of perdition; and that the Roman church is papist and antichristian. Because the supporting material for this is so abundant we have put off to another disputation a fuller demonstration of this.[22]

Augustine, Sermon 13, *On the Words of the Lord according to Matthew*

He [Christ] said, "You, therefore, are Peter, and on this rock, which you acknowledged when you said 'you are the Christ, the Son of the living God,' I shall build my Church; I shall build you upon me and not myself on you."

The same [author] in the *Treatise on John* 124

He said, "On this rock I shall build my Church." For the rock was Christ, and on that foundation Peter also was built. For no-one can establish any other foundation than the one that was established by Christ Jesus.

The same [author] in the *Treatise on John* 118

And although all of them were asked, it was only Peter who replied: "You are the Christ." And he said to him: "I shall give you the keys," as if he alone received the power to bind and to loosen, since he was the one who had spoken on behalf of the others, and had received this together with the others, as if he were the embodiment of the unity itself. And so it was one on behalf of them all, because there was a unity in them all.

---

21 In response to John Calvin's reference to these texts (*Institutes* 4.20.7), Bellarmine claims that Christ does not forbid the disciples to command each other not in any way at all (*ullo modo*), but only not as the kings of the Gentiles. Bellarmine, *Disputationes*, controversy 3, book 1, "De Romani Pontificis Ecclesiastica Monarchia," chapter 9 (*Opera* 1:484); see also book 5, "De Protestate Pontificis Temporali," chapter 10 (*Opera* 2:165) where Bellarmine makes similar statements in response to Calvin, *Institutes* 4.11.8.

22 This does not refer to a disputation in the *SPT*, but Thysius or one of his colleagues might have been planning on writing a separate disputation on the issue. No such contemporary disputation was found thus far. Thysius was interested in the subject; he transcribed the tract "De Antichristo", written by Nicholas of Clémanges (c. 1360–1434/1440) for the 1613 edition of the French humanist's *Opera*. See Nicholas of Clémanges, Johannes Martinus Lydius (ed.), *Opera omnia* (Leiden: Johannes Baldwin, 1613), 32.

Gregorius Papa lib. 6. c. 194. *Epist.* 30.[a]

Ego fidenter dico, quia quisquis se universalem Sacerdotem vocat, vel vocari desiderat, in elatione sua Antichristum praecurrit.

[a] Gregory the Great, *Epistolae* 7.30 (CCSL 140:491).

Pope Gregory, Book 6, chapter 194, letter 30

I state with confidence that whoever calls himself, or longs to be called, a universal priest, by elevating himself surpasses the Antichrist.

DISPUTATIO XLII

De Ministrorum Ecclesiasticorum vocatione et functionibus

Praeside D. JOHANNE POLYANDRO
Respondente ISAACO VALCKNAER

THESIS I Quemadmodum Dominus noster Jesus Christus, unicum Ecclesiae Catholicae caput, eam invisibiliter per Spiritum Sanctum; sic eandem visibiliter per Regni sui oeconomos et administros in hoc mundo gubernat.

II Horum alii quibuslibet Ecclesiae membris bona spiritualia, alii quibusdam τὰ βιωτικὰ, seu corporalia, ad hujus vitae alimentum necessaria administrant.

III Priorum duo sunt genera. Nonnulli enim et verbi* divini, et regiminis Ecclesiastici, nonnulli regiminis tantum Ecclesiastici sunt administri.

IV Vocatio administrorum verbi* divini, quemadmodum et ceterorum Ecclesiae Christi publice inservientium, non tantum ex interno Spiritus Sancti instinctu atque afflatu praeeunte, sed etiam ex externo verorum Ecclesiae membrorum assensu subsequente cognoscitur.

V Internus Spiritus Sancti instinctus, quo virorum Dei praecordia ad sacrosancti Ministerii desiderium efficaciter flectuntur atque excitantur, in omnibus fidis Dei servis, *ad Ecclesiae ipsius administrationem vocatis*, priusquam munus suum subeant et obeant, necessario requiritur. Nam sicuti Domini messis est, operarios suos in vineam suam emittere, Matt. 9, 38. sic nemo ex fidis illius operariis hunc sibi sumit honorem, sed qui a Deo vocatur. Quod Aaronis exemplo probat* Apostolus, Hebr. 5, 4. hacque interrogatione innuit, *Quomodo praedicabunt, nisi missi fuerint?* Rom. 10, 15. De Pseudoprophetis Deus e contrario pronunciat, *Me non mittente, hi Prophetae cucurrerunt, meque ipsos non alloquente prophetarunt*, Jer. 23, 21.

DISPUTATION 42

On the Calling of those who Minister to the Church, and on Their Duties

President: Johannes Polyander
Respondent: Isaac Valckenaer[1]

Our Lord Jesus Christ, as the one and only Head of the universal Church, governs it unseen by his Holy Spirit; he likewise governs it in this world also visibly through stewards and ministers of his kingdom. 1

Some of them bestow goods of a spiritual sort upon all the Church's members, while others bestow upon some goods of a bodily sort (*ta biōtika*) needed for the sustenance of this life. 2

Of the former there are two kinds of helpers: some administer God's Word* as well as the government of the Church, while others administer only the Church's government. 3

The calling of those who administer God's Word,* like that of the other public servants of Christ's Church, is made known not only by the Holy Spirit's prior inward prompting and inspiration, but also by the subsequent outward approval of the genuine members of the Church. 4

One necessary requirement is the prompting by the Holy Spirit inwardly in all God's faithful servants called to administer his Church, a prompting whereby the hearts of godly men are effectively inclined and roused to desire the holy ministry before they take up and begin their task. For just as it belongs to the Lord of the harvest to send forth his workers into his vineyard (Matthew 9[:38]), so too does none of his faithful workers take this honor upon himself, but only he who has been called by God. The apostle makes* this point with the example of Aaron (Hebrews 5:4) and he implies as much with this question: "How are they to preach unless they have been sent?" (Romans 10:15). And on the other hand, concerning the false prophets, God declares: "Though I did not 5

1 Born c. 1603 in Leiden, Isaac Valckenaer matriculated on February 21, 1613 at the age of 10. He defended this disputation in 1623. He was ordained in Nieuwveen in 1626 and 's-Hertogenbosch 1628; he died in 1653. See Du Rieu, *Album studiosorum*, 109, Van Lieburg, *Repertorium*, 256, P.H.A.M. Abels and A.P.F. Wouters, *De grote kerkelijke vergadering van 's-Hertogenbosch in 1648* ('s-Hertogenbosch: Rijksarchief, 1986), 1:30–31.

VI Cum Socinianis, qui singularem aliquam mittendi rationem* ad sacrum ministerium obeundum requiri negant, haec loca objicimus, regerunt, Apostolum Hebr. 5, 4. de solo loqui Pontificatu Aaronico, in quo olim plus honoris erat, quam laboris: at in hodierno ministerio Ecclesiastico, plus laboris esse quam honoris, neque hujusmodi ministerium, idoneos ad docendum sibi sumere, aut arrogare, cum jus illud concupiscendi atque obeundi ex dono alios docendi habeant, *In Catech. Socin. Racoviensi cap. 2.*[a] *De regimine et gubernatione Ecclesiae Christi. Socin. in Tract. de Ecclesia.*[b] *Theoph. Nicolaid. in defens. Tractat. Socin. de Ecclesia, cap. 1.*[c]

VII Falsa est haec Socinianorum ad locum illum ex cap. 5. ad Hebraeos exceptio. Quamvis enim Apostolus ibi in genere disserens de Pontificatu, hoc suum axioma, *Nemo sibi sumit hunc honorem, sed qui vocatur a Deo*, Aaronis exemplo ὑποδειγματικῶς illustret, cum tamen Pontificatum ab effectis sacri Ministerii Ecclesiastici, ibidem describat, et ex Logicorum regula *de similibus idem sit judicium*, necessario sequitur axioma illud Apostoli generale, ratione* Ministerii Ecclesiastici, cujus sunt variae species,* eodem modo ad alios Ministros Eccle-

[a] *Catechesis Ecclesiarum quae in Regno Poloniae* (Rakow: [s.n.], 1609), 298–308. [b] Faustus Socinus, *Tractatus de ecclesia* (Rakow: [s.n.], 1611). [c] [Valentinus Smalcius], *Defensio, brevis Anonymi cuiusdam, qui est Faustus Socinus, de Ecclesia et ministrorum missione tractatus adversus responsionem Andreae Miedziboz. A Theophilo Nicolaide ante annos quinque conscripta, nunc autem edita* (Rakow: [Sebastian Sternacki], 1612), 138–140 (= ch. 1 of the *second* part of this work, *De missione ministrorum*).

send them, these prophets ran, and though I did not address them, yet they prophesied" (Jeremiah 23:21).[2]

And when we bring these passages forward in objection to the Socinians 6
who deny that some special motivation* is required to enter upon the sacred ministry, they retort that in Hebrews 5:4 the apostle is speaking only about the high-priestly office of Aaron, which once consisted more of honor than actual work; but that today's ecclesiastical ministry consists more in work than honor,[3] and [they retort] that those suited to teaching do not assume or take upon themselves a ministry of that [Aaronic] sort, since it is on the basis of their gift to teach others that they possess that right to desire it and enter upon it (*The Racovian Catechism*, [section 8,] chapter 2, 'On Governing and Guiding the Church of Christ;' Faustus Socinus, *Treatise on the Church*; and Theophilus Nicolaides, *Defense of Socinus's Treatise on the Church*, chapter 1).[4]

The restriction that the Socinians place upon that passage in Hebrews 5 is 7
wrong. In discussing the office of high priest in general in this text, the apostle indeed illustrates his axiomatic statement, "No-one takes this honor upon himself, but he who is called by God," hypodigmatically[5] with the example of Aaron. Nevertheless, since he there defines the office of high priest from the effects of the sacred ecclesiastical ministry, it also necessarily follows from the logical rule that "for things that are the same the assessment must be the same,"[6] that the apostle's general axiom can*—on the basis* of the ecclesiastical ministry

2 Polyander deals with the Socinian objections to Hebrews 5:4 in theses 6–8, to Romans 10:15 in theses 9–12, and to Jeremiah 23:21 in thesis 13 below.

3 This part of the argument, which Polyander cites from Smalcius's *Defensio brevis* to circumvent the parallel between the Aaronic priestly office and the present-day ministry, may seem somewhat confusing. This is because Smalcius does not so much address the Protestants here as specifically his Roman Catholic interlocutor Rościszewski (see the note with the Latin text in thesis 6), concluding his argument with the following scathing remark: "We give those honors to the papal teachers. For most of them flee the work, [and] pursue only the honors."

4 Theophilus Nicolaides was a pseudonym for Valentin Schmalz or Valentinus Smalcius (1572–1622), a German Socinian who translated the *Racovian Catechism* into German and the New Testament into Polish. On Socinus, the Socinians, and the *Racovian Catechism* see *SPT* 2.28, 7.50, 22.37, 25 antithesis 5, 26.20–22, 31.10 and 29. In his *Defense of Socinus's Treatise on the Church*, Smalcius responded to a work from the Polish Jesuit Wojciech Rościszewski (1556/60–1619), who wrote under the pseudonym Andreas Miedziboz.

5 A 'hypodigm' is an example in the sense that it serves as the basis for a description and thus determines it—the Greek word is used in Hebrews 8:5 and 9:23 for the earthly representations of the heavenly things. A 'paradigm,' by way of contrast, is an example in the sense of a typical instance, which is non-determinative.

6 This general rule is often quoted, also in juridical contexts. It is difficult to trace the origin or to decide from where Polyander borrows it.

siasticos, cujuscunque sint ordinis, accommodari posse,* quo illud ab Apostolo ad Aaronem peculiariter applicatur, cum nullum aut ex Prophetis, aut ex Apostolis et Evangelistis, aut ex aliis Ministris Ecclesiasticis a Deo approbatis exemplum dissimile ex sacris literis proferri possit. Nemo enim ex illis absque Dei vocatione dignitatem muneris Ecclesiastici sibi sumpsisse legitur.

VIII Pontificis deinde Aaronici λειτουργία, qua sacra quorum mentionem ibidem facit Apostolus, tam suo, quam populi nomine peragebat, non minoris erat laboris, quam honoris, ac proinde honor ab Apostolo synecdochice* nuncupatur, propterea quod ob istam λειτουργίαν duplici honore dignus esset, quod Apostolus de Presbyteris quoque Novi Testamenti asserit, 1 Tim. 5, 17. Nec plus aut minus, sed tantum laboris, quantum honoris Apostolus operi sacri ministerii attribuit, cum illud opus praeclarum appellat, 1 Tim. 3, 1. Et quamvis desiderium Episcopatus, ut ibidem docet Apostolus, sit laudabile, eorum tamen culpanda est ambitio, qui nec Dei missionem, nec Ecclesiae approbationem exspectantes, munus illud ex proprio judicio ac privato arbitrio* capessunt.

IX Ad locum Rom. 10, 15. regerunt, Paulum de suo tantum tempore loqui, cum adhuc nova et inaudita esset Evangelii doctrina, ac proinde res ipsa postularet, ut qui eam essent annunciaturi, missionem suam docere possent; cum vero hoc nostro tempore nihil novi afferatur, sed antiqua Evangelii doctrina proponatur, ideo non opus esse singulari quadam vocatione. *Osterod. in Instit. cap. 42.*[a] *Theoph. Nicolaid. in defens. Socin. de Ecclesia.*[b]

[a] Christoph Ostorodt, *Unterrichtung von den vornemsten Hauptpuncten der Christlichen Religion* (Rakow: Sternatzki, 1604), 437–440. [b] [Valentinus Smalcius], *Defensio de Ecclesia*, 140–141.

(that consists of various kinds*)—be applied to others in the ecclesiastical ministry (of whatever rank) in the same way that the apostle applies it to Aaron specifically.[7] For from the sacred writings no other, different example can be produced from among the prophets or the apostles or evangelists, or the other ecclesiastical ministers whom God has approved. For one does not read that anyone of them took upon himself the position of an ecclesiastical office without a calling by God.

Moreover, the liturgical service of the Aaronic high priest, wherein he performed the rites (mentioned by the apostle in that passage) on behalf of the people and himself, consisted equally in work and in honor. And hence by synecdoche*[8] the apostle called it an honor, since it was on account of that liturgical service that he was worthy of double honor, something that the apostle states also about the elders in the New Testament (1 Timothy 5:17). And to the task of the sacred ministry the apostle ascribes neither more nor less work than honor, but just as much work as honor, when he calls that work "noble" (1 Timothy 3:1). And although it is a noble thing to aspire to the office of bishop, as the apostle teaches in the same passage, nevertheless we should find fault with the ambition of those who wait neither for the sending by God nor the Church's approval, but seize upon that office on the basis of their own personal decision and choice.* 8

And their retort to the passage in Romans 10:15 is that Paul is speaking about his own time-period only, since the Gospel-teaching was still new and unheard, and that therefore the very subject-matter demanded that those who were going to proclaim it be able to demonstrate their own mission. [They claim that] since in our day and age nothing new is being introduced but rather the old teaching of the Gospel is presented, there is no need for some special calling (Osterodt, *Instruction*, chapter 42 and Theophilus Nicolaides, *Defense of Socinus's Treatise on the Church*).[9] 9

7 Polyander thus applies two instruments of logic to argue that what Hebrews 5 says of Aaron can indeed be applied to all ecclesiastical ministers: 1) Aaron is a *hypodigmatic* example here (see note 5 above); and 2) the description of the highly priestly office is from the effects of the ecclesiastical ministry, which consequently can be applied to all ecclesiastical ministers.

8 In a synecdoche a less comprehensive term is employed to refer to a more comprehensive one or vice versa; cf. *SPT* 4.17, note 11.

9 For the exegesis of Romans 10:15 see thesis 6 above. The Socinian Christoph Ostorodt (c. 1560–1611) visited Leiden in 1598 together with Andreas Wojdowski, when they were banned by the States of Holland. Back in Poland they published a defense entitled *Apologia: ofte verantwoordinghe op't decreet der Staten der vereenichde Nederlanden* (Rakow: [Rodecki], 1600).

x Haec Socinianorum exceptio, veritati quoque adversatur. Non minus enim haec Apostoli interrogatio, *Quomodo praedicabunt, nisi missi fuerint?* quam praecedentes, in enunciationem universalem est resolvenda. Proinde sicuti semper et ubique vera sunt atque erunt haec axiomata, *Nulli invocabunt Deum, in quem non crediderunt, nulli credent ei, de quo non audierunt, nulli audient absque praedicante*: sic idem de isto axiomate Apostolico censendum est, *Nulli praedicabunt*, nimirum legitime, *nisi missi fuerint*. Nec per opus Praedicationis Evangelicae solis Apostolis, sed aliis quoque Pastoribus, ut videre est Matt. 26, 13. et 28, 20. et alibi, attribuitur.

xi Nova praeterea doctrina Apostolis falso affingitur, qui nihil crediderunt nec docuerunt, extra ea quae scripta sunt in Lege et Prophetis, ut liquet ex confessione Apostoli Pauli, Act. 24, 14. et 26, 22. Nec non ex ipsius responsione ad Judaeorum qui Romae habitabant, interrogationem, quaenam sentiret. His enim cum testificatione dicitur exposuisse Regnum Dei, *suadens eis quae de Jesu Christo sunt, ex Lege et Prophetis*, Act. 28, 23. Non ergo missio Apostolorum fuit novae doctrinae, sed divinae vocationis indicium, et conformis vocationi Prophetarum qui eodem modo missi sunt, tametsi nihil novi, sed eadem quae Moses, dixerint, calamoque suo consignaverint.

xii Quocirca futilis est *Socini* adversus Pontificios exceptio, ab iis contendi non posse, ut Ministri qui cum ipsis non consentiunt, suae vocationis, aut muneris, legitimum auctorem ostendant, cum non gerant se pro novis Christi Apostolis, aut divinis Prophetis; nec inauditam prius doctrinam aut Religionem* mundo se annunciare profiteantur, neque ex novis principiis* priusve incognitis testimoniis* quidquam doceant, sed ea tantum quae apud omnes Christiani nominis certissima sunt, ex ipsis scilicet Evangelistarum et Apostolorum scriptis. *Socin. in Tract. de Ecclesia*.[a] Idem enim Apostolus de se scribit, Rom. 1, 1. quod Evangelium praedicaverit non ex novis principiis,* aut prius incognitis testimoniis,* sed illud quod Deus ante promiserat in Scripturis Sanctis per Prophetas. Nihilominus tamen vocationis suae aut muneris auctorem legitimum

[a] Faustus Socinus, *Tractatus de ecclesia*, 13.

Ostorodt's *Unterrichtung* appeared one year before the Racovian Catechism and summarized the Socinian view of Christian doctrines. The rendering of the title as *Institutio* is Polyander's own, as the work was not translated into Latin, or at least no Latin publication is known.

This restriction of the Socinians conflicts with the truth, too. For this question of the apostle, "How are they to preach unless they have been sent?" should be taken as a pronouncement that can be applied universally no less than the preceding questions. And, just as the following axiomatic statements are and will be true always and everywhere—"no people shall call upon a God in whom they did not believe," "none shall believe in him of whom they have not heard," "no people shall hear without someone to preach"—so too we should judge that apostolic axiom to be true: "No persons shall preach" (legitimately, of course) "unless they have been sent." And the work of the preaching of the Gospel is not attributed only to the apostles, but to other pastors, too, as can be seen in Matthew 26:13, 28:20, and elsewhere. 10

And what is more, it is false to claim a new teaching for the apostles, for they neither believed nor taught anything beyond what was written in the Law and the prophets, as is clear from the apostle Paul's testimony in Acts 24:14, and 26:22. And this is clear also from his answer to the Jews dwelling at Rome who asked him what he thought. For Acts 28:23 states that he testified to them and revealed to them the kingdom of God, "persuading them of the things concerning Jesus from the Law and the prophets." Therefore the sending of the apostles was an indication not of a new teaching, but of the calling by God, and it conformed to the calling of the prophets who were sent in the same manner (although they, too, said nothing new, but the same things as Moses) and confirmed Moses' writing with their own. 11

And for this reason Socinus's objection to the papal teachers is pointless, that they cannot demand that ministers who disagree with them must demonstrate the lawful author of their calling or office because [according to Socinus the ministers] do not conduct themselves as new apostles of Christ nor as prophets sent by God. And also, they do not profess that they are declaring to the world a teaching or religion* that has not been heard before. Furthermore that they are not teaching anything based on new principles* or previously unheard-of testimonies,* but only those things that are beyond all doubt for those who are called Christians—that is, things that come from the very writings of the evangelists and the apostles (Socinus, *Treatise on the Church*).[10] For the same apostle writes about himself (Romans 1:1) that he has preached that Gospel not on the basis of new principles* or previously unknown testimonies,* but that which God had promised previously in the Scriptures through the prophets. Nevertheless, in the same passage he also points out the lawful author of his 12

10 Polyander argues that Socinus's objection to the Roman Catholics is pointless because the prophets and the apostles never claimed to teach anything new.

Romanis ibidem ostendit, cum se ex Dei vocatione Apostolum separatum ad illud Evangelium praedicandum asseverat.

XIII Futilis quoque est asseclarum *Socini* exceptio, ac nominatim *Ostorodii* ad locum Jer. 23, 21.[a] Deum ibi agere de Pseudoprophetis qui jactitabant se esse Prophetas a Deo missos, ut novi aliquid idque singulare populo annunciarent. Nam hujusmodi gloriatione de suae doctrinae novitate se esse successores verorum Prophetarum demonstrare* non potuerunt, cum Moses sacrorum suorum scriptorum conformitatem cum praecedentibus Dei revelationibus non scriptis, ab Adamo usque ad sua tempora in primo suo libro ostendat, ac Christus posteriorum Prophetarum doctrinae antiquitatem ex ejus ἁρμονίᾳ cum Mosis doctrina declaret, Matt. 7, 12. Luc. 24, 27.

XIV Atque haec de necessitate vocationis Ministrorum Ecclesiasticorum quae fit a Deo, dicta sufficiant: cujus vocationis modum si spectemus, aut fit a Deo immediate,* aut mediate,* aut extraordinarie, aut ordinarie.

XV Immediata* vocatio est, qua nonnulli ad munus docendi regendique Ecclesiam a Deo vocantur absque hominum opera atque interventu, qualis, sicuti olim fuit vocatio Mosis, Esaiae, Jeremiae, sub Vetere, ita et Apostolorum sub Novo Foedere ab ipso Christo missorum ad praedicandum Evangelium.

XVI Mediata* vocatio est, cum Deus aliquos vocat interveniente aliorum hominum administratione, qualis fuit Aaronis ac ceterorum Sacerdotum et Levitarum sub Veteri, Timothei, Titi, Episcoporum, Presbyterorum et Diaconorum sub Novo Testamento.

XVII Extraordinaria vocatio est, qua nonnulli donis extraordinariis supra communem* aliorum Ministrorum sortem a Deo exornati, ab ipso extra ordinem ac seriem praecedentium Ministrorum Ecclesiae a Deo vocantur, cujusmodi vocatio fuit Prophetarum in Veteri, Apostolorum, Prophetarum, et Evangelistarum in Novo Testamento. Quorum vocatio fuit temporaria, sub Veteri foedere ad Ecclesiae Dei collapsae instaurationem, sub Novo ad ejusdem dilatandae propagationem ordinata.

XVIII Ordinaria vocatio est, qua aliqui donis ordinariis a Deo instructi, ordinariam ac communem* Ecclesiae Dei operam praestant; qualis olim fuit Patriarcharum ante legem, Sacerdotum et Levitarum sub Lege, Pastorum vero et Doctorum sub Evangelio vocatio, quae ad Ecclesiae Christianae a temporibus Apostolorum per totum orbem terrarum dispersae, aedificationem quibuslibet in locis promovendam, usque ad finem mundi locum habebit, juxta Christi promissio-

[a] Christoph Ostorodt, *Unterrichtung*, 437.

calling and office to the people at Rome when he asserts that he is an apostle set apart by God's calling for that task of preaching the Gospel.

13 Also pointless is the objection that Socinus's epigones (and Ostorodt in particular) make against the passage in Jeremiah 23:21, that God there is concerned with the false prophets who boasted that they were prophets sent by God so that they could declare something to the people that was new and special. For by that sort of boasting about the novelty of their own teaching they could not show* that they were the successors of the true prophets, since Moses (in his first book) shows that his own writings conformed to the prior, unrecorded revelations of God from the time of Adam to his own day, and since Christ demonstrates that the teaching of the later prophets is ancient by virtue of its harmony with the teaching of Moses (Matthew 7:12; Luke 24:27).

14 But let these statements about the requirement that the calling of the ministers of the Church come from God be sufficient. Let us look now to the manner of this calling, which comes from God immediately* or mediately* or extraordinarily or ordinarily.

15 The immediate* calling is the one whereby God, not using the aid or intervention of other men, calls some men to the task of teaching and ruling the Church. Such was the calling of Moses in ancient times, and of Isaiah and Jeremiah under the old covenant, and so also that of the apostles whom Christ himself sent to preach the Gospel under the new covenant.

16 The mediate* calling occurs when God calls some men through the intervening assistance of other men, as was the case for Aaron and the other priests and Levites under the Old Testament, and of Timothy, Titus, and the overseers, elders and deacons under the New Testament.

17 The extraordinary calling is the one whereby some, endowed by God with exceptional gifts beyond the common* lot of other ministers, are called by God apart from the order and sequence of the previous ministers of the Church. This manner of calling was that of the prophets in the Old Testament, and of the apostles, prophets, and evangelists in the New Testament. Their calling was arranged for a definite term: under the old covenant for the restoration of God's Church that had fallen apart; and under the new for the propagation of the Church that was to be expanded.

18 The ordinary calling is the one whereby some men whom God equipped with ordinary gifts render to God's Church the ordinary, common* assistance. Such was the calling of the patriarchs before the time of the Law, the calling of the priests and the Levites under the time of the Law, and of the pastors and teachers at the time of the Gospel. This calling will serve to promote in every location the upbuilding of the Christian Church that has been scattered through all the lands of the whole world from the time of the apostles all

nem, Matt. 28, 20. *Ite et docete omnes gentes, baptizantes, et docentes eos servare omnia quae mandavi vobis. Et ego vobiscum sum omnibus diebus usque ad consummationem seculi.*

XIX Quo respiciens Apostolus extraordinariam primorum ac temporariorum Ecclesiae Catholicae fundatorum vocationem primo loco ponit, eorumque tres tantum ordines recenset, cum Christum ait post ascensionem in coelos dedisse alios *Apostolos*, alios vero *Prophetas*, alios autem *Evangelistas*, ad aedificationem corporis sui mystici, nimirum Ecclesiae, Eph. 4, 11. et 12.

XX His duos tantum ordinariorum ac perpetuorum verbi divini administrorum ordines ibidem conjunctim subjungit, cum addit, eundem Christum alios praeterea dedisse *Pastores et Doctores, ad coagmentationem Sanctorum, et opus Ministerii, donec evadamus omnes in unitatem fidei et cognitionis Christi in virum adultum ad mensuram perfectae in ipso staturae*. Cui operi ut Pastores commodius vacarent, ipsis Seniores ad Ecclesiae gubernationem, et Diaconi ad curam pauperum aliorumque afflictorum, ex Christi Apostolorumque institutione, Matt. 18. Act. 6. adjuncti sunt, de quibus suo loco disseremus.

XXI Apostoli erant praecones Evangelii universales ad Ecclesiae Catholicae fundamentum, quod est Christus, ubique terrarum ponendum, ab ipso Christo immediate* atque extra ordinem missi, dono absque errore alios docendi, doctrinaeque suae veritatem miraculis confirmandi a Deo instructi, Matt. 28, 19. 1 Cor. 3, 10. 11. Matt. 10, 1. Joh. 16, 13. Act. 2, 2. et seqq.

XXII Prophetae qui sub Novo Testamento vixerunt, dono, tum futura praedicendi, tum loca Scripturae difficiliora perspicue interpretandi et ad Ecclesiae aedificationem dextre applicandi, a Deo praediti fuerunt. A priore dono describitur Agabus qui famem sub Claudio et Pauli vincula praenunciavit, Act. 11, 28. et 21, 10. Ab utroque, Barnabas, Simeon, alias dictus Niger, Lucius Cyrenaeus, Manahen et Saulus, qui propterea Prophetae et Doctores a Luca appellantur, Act. 13, 1. A posteriore, illi de quibus Apostolus disserit, 1 Cor. 14, 29. et seqq.

XXIII Evangelistarum alii erant Scriptores historiae Evangelicae, de vita et morte, dictis et factis Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi, alii ab Apostolis ad Evangelium una cum ipsis praedicandum vocati, ideoque ipsos ut συνεργοὶ, comitabantur, nisi cum ab ipsis ad tempus certis quibusdam Ecclesiis praeficerentur; quales

the way to the end of the world, in keeping with Christ's promise: "Go and teach all nations, baptizing and teaching them to keep everything that I have commanded you. And I am with you each and every day, even to the end of the world" (Matthew 28:[19–]20).

19 It is with an eye to this that the apostle assigns first place to the extraordinary calling of the earliest, temporary builders of the catholic Church, and he counts only three different orders for them when he says that Christ, after his ascension into heaven, gave some to be "apostles," some "prophets," and others "evangelists" for the upbuilding of his mystical body, that is to say, the Church (Ephesians 4:11–12).

20 In that same text, the apostle joins to these only two, connected orders of ordinary, ongoing ministers of God's Word, when he goes on to say that the same Christ gave in addition some to be "pastors and teachers, to equip the saints for the work of ministry, until we all should reach the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of Christ, to mature manhood, to the measure of the stature which belongs to the fullness of Christ" [Ephesians 4:11–13]. In order that the pastors could be free to do this task more conveniently, they added elders to their rank for the government of the Church, and deacons to care for the poor and other afflicted people, as instituted by Christ and the apostles (Matthew 18[:18], Acts 6[:3]). We shall discuss these offices in their proper place.

21 The "apostles" were world-wide preachers of the Gospel for the foundation of the catholic Church (which is Christ), and for establishing it everywhere on earth—men sent by Christ himself immediately* and apart from any order, with the gift of teaching others without error, and instructed by God to confirm the truth of their teaching by miracles (Matthew 28:19; 1 Corinthians 3:10–11; Matthew 10:1; John 16:13; Acts 2:2 and following).

22 God had endowed the prophets who lived under the New Testament with the gift of heralding the things that were to come and of explaining the more difficult passages of Scripture with clarity, and applying them skillfully to the upbuilding of the Church. Described as having the former gift was Agabus, who predicted the famine that occurred during Claudius's reign, as well as Paul's imprisonment (Acts 11:28, and 21:10). And depicted as having both gifts were Barnabas, Simeon (also called Niger), Lucius of Cyrene, Manahen and Saul, all of whom Luke calls prophets and teachers (Acts 13:1). And described as having the latter gift are those whom the apostle discusses in 1 Corinthians 14:29 and following.

23 Of the "evangelists," some were those who wrote the history of the Gospel, about the life and death of our Savior Jesus Christ, and of his words and deeds, while others were called by the apostles to preach the Gospel along with them, and for that reason they accompanied them as fellow-workers

erant Barnabas, Silas, Timotheus et Titus, quibus nonnulli 70. discipulos, quorum Lucas meminit cap. 10, 1. annumerandos esse existimant.

XXIV Quamvis Barnabas, qui plerumque Apostolo Paulo Gentibus Evangelium annuncianti praesto fuit, Apostolus vocetur Act. 14, 14. non ideo tamen (ut nonnulli putant) ceteris duodecim Apostolis in Apostolatu una cum Paulo accessit, qui ad munus illud singulari omnino ratione* atque immediate* a Christo e coelo vocatus fuit, Act. 9, 5. In illo enim loco Apostolus latiore significatione appellatur, atque eodem sensu quo Epaphroditus Apostoli Pauli collega individuus, Ecclesiae Philippensis Apostolus nominatur, id est, Legatus ab ista Ecclesia Romam missus, ut ibi Apostolo Paulo necessaria subministraret, Phil. 2, 25.

XXV Pastores erant verbi divini dispensatores certis Ecclesiis docendis ac regendis ab Apostolis et Evangelistis praefecti, quorum officium describitur, Act. 20. 1 Tim. 3. Tit. 1. et 1 Pet. 5.

XXVI Horum officii partes ipsis cum superioribus verbi divini administris extraordinariis communes* sunt, 1. Populum Dei ex verbo ipsius docere. 2. Eidem juxta Christi institutionem Sacramenta* administrare. 3. Pro eodem preces suas ad Deum fundere. 4. Eum freno disciplinae Ecclesiasticae intra limites obedientiae Deo secundum verbum* ipsius debitae continere, Matt. 28. et 18, 17. Act. 20, 36. Eph. 4, 14.

XXVII Doctores erant Prophetarum Novi Testamenti imitatores, qui diversarum linguarum, scientiarum* atque historiarum cognitione instructi, Sacras Scripturas juxta fidei analogiam* interpretabantur, easque apta methodo aliis proponentes, ab haereticorum corruptelis et infidelium calumniis vindicabant. Quos idcirco Apostolus a pastoribus discernit, quod illi in doctrina et redargutione ad fidem vacillantium confirmandam; hi in correctione et admonitione ad vitam peccantium emendandam, operas suas praecipue occuparent. Unde illis κατ᾽ ἐξοχὴν docendi, his exhortandi munus attribuitur, Rom. 12, 7. 8.

except when they were, for a time, by them put in charge of specific churches. Such were Barnabas, Silas, Timothy and Titus; some people think that the seventy disciples whom Luke mentions in chapter 10:1 should be counted among them.[11]

Even though Barnabas, who was of service mainly to the apostle Paul in 24
proclaiming the Gospel to the gentiles, is called an apostle in Acts 14:14, that is not a reason for him to be added to the twelve apostles in the apostleship along with Paul, as some people think, for Christ from heaven had called Paul to that office for an entirely unique reason,* and immediately* (Acts 9:5). For in the former passage Barnabas is called an apostle in a broader sense, in the same sense that Epaphroditus, the apostle Paul's personal colleague, is called the apostle to the church at Philippi, that is, as an ambassador sent to Rome by that church, in order to supply the needs of the apostle Paul (Philippians 2:25).

The "pastors" were stewards of God's Word whom the apostles and evange- 25
lists had put in charge of teaching and governing specific churches, whose office is described in Acts 20, 1 Timothy 3, Titus 1, and 1 Peter 5.

The parts of their office were the same* as those of the previously mentioned 26
extraordinary ministers of God's Word: 1) To teach God's people from his Word; 2) To administer the sacraments* to them as instituted by Christ; 3) To pour out prayers to God on their behalf; 4) To keep them, with the reins of ecclesiastical discipline, within the boundaries of obedience that is owed to God by his own Word* (Matthew 28[:19], and 18:17; Acts 20:36; Ephesians 4:14).

The "teachers" were those who succeeded the prophets of the New Tes- 27
tament,[12] and as they were equipped with knowledge* of diverse languages, sciences, and histories, they would explain the sacred Scriptures by the analogy* of faith,[13] and with an appropriate method pass them on to others, and defend them over against the corruptions by heretics and false accusations by unbelievers. Therefore the apostle distinguishes them from pastors, because they fulfill their services in a special way; the former kept themselves busy with teaching and refuting for the sake of strengthening the faith of those who wavered, while the latter busied themselves in correction and admonition for the sake of repairing the lives of sinners. For this reason

11 It is not clear to whom Polyander is referring here.

12 According to Calvin, the teachers (*doctors*) held a special office in the church next to the pastors; see *Institutes* 4.3.4. On the background of the office see Robert W. Henderson, *The Teaching Office in the Reformed Tradition: A History of the Doctoral Ministry* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, [1962]).

13 Difficult passages in Scripture were to be explained from its general meaning, as construed from the clear and unambiguous texts. See *DLGTT* s.v. "analogia fidei." Cf. *SPT* 15.6, note 4.

XXVIII Hisce Evangelii praeconibus, tam extraordinariis, quam ordinariis, nomen* Ministrorum communiter attribuitur ab Apostolo, 1 Cor. 3, 5. *Quis igitur Paulus? quis autem Apollos? nisi Ministri per quos credidistis?* Et cap. 4, 1. *Sic de nobis reputet homo, ut de Ministris Christi et dispensatoribus mysteriorum Dei.* Et 1 Tim. 4, 6. *Hoc si subjeceris fratribus, bonus eris Minister Jesu Christi.*

XXIX Iisdem idem Apostolus Episcoporum et Presbyterorum epitheton indifferenter assignat, Act. 20, 28. ubi Presbyteros Ecclesiae Ephesinae monet, ut attendant animum ad semetipsos et totum gregem, in quo Spiritus Sanctus ipsos constituerat Episcopos. 1 Tim. 3, 2. ubi Episcopum describit ab attributis* et effectis, quae Apostolus Petrus suis praescribit συμπρεσβυτέροις, 1 Pet. 5, 1. 2. 3. Sic in Epistola ad Philippenses c. 1, 1. sub nomine* Episcoporum quibus gratiam Dei comprecatur, eos intelligit qui Philippis verbo et gubernationi praeerant, eosque a Diaconis aerarii Ecclesiastici oeconomis distinguit. Et Tit. 1. quos v. 5. Presbyteros nominaverat, vers 7. Episcopos appellat, non correlate ad Presbyteros tamquam ad secundarios sibique subordinatos praesules, sed ad Ecclesiam vigilanti ipsorum curae atque inspectioni commissam. Non enim alicujus in alios Christi Ministros auctoritatis, aut alicujus prae aliis praerogativae, sed solius istius curae ac vigilantiae respectu, Episcoporum titulo in sacris literis insigniuntur.

XXX Non ergo ex divino, sed ex humano instituto aliquis post Apostolorum tempora, aliis ex ordine Presbyterorum fuit auctoritate Praepositus atque Episcopus dictus ex singulari praerogativa, sicuti post Hieronymum nonnulli quoque Pontificii confitentur, nominatim, Lombardus, Gratianus, Cusanus, et alii, Hieronymus *In Tit.* cap. 1.[a] et *ad Evagr.*[b] Lomb. *lib.* 4. *dist.* 24.[c] Grat. *dist.* 93. *c. legimus. et dist.* 95. *c. olim.*[d] Cusanus *De Concordantia Catholica*, lib. 2. cap. 13.[e]

---

[a] Jerome, *Commentariorum in Epistulam ad Titum liber unus* 1.5 (CCSL 77C:14). [b] Jerome, *Ep.* 146.1 (CSEL 56:310). [c] Lombard, *Sententiae* 4.24. [d] Gratian, *Decretum* 93.24 in Emil Friedberg, ed., *Decretum magistri Gratiani*, 2 vols. (Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1879–1881), 1:327–329. Gratian, *Decretum* 95.5 in *Decretum magistri Gratiani* 1:332–333. The chapters are here referred to according to the first word of the text. In this case to distinction 93, chapter 24 "legimus," and distinction 95. chapter 5 "olim." [e] Nicolai de Cusa, *De concordantia catholica* 2.13 (*Opera omnia* 14/2:150).

the duty to teach is ascribed especially to the former, and the duty to exhort especially to the latter (Romans 12:7–8).

28 In 1 Corinthians 3:5 it is upon these Gospel-preachers—whether ordinary or extraordinary—that the apostle bestows the name* of minister: "Therefore who is Paul? And who is Apollos? Are they not ministers through whom you have come to faith?" And, "Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God" (1 Corinthians 4:1); and: "If you point this out to the brothers, you will be a good minister of Jesus Christ" (1 Timothy 4:6).

29 The same apostle also gives the epithets of "overseers" and "elders" to those men without differentiation in Acts 20:28, where he warns the elders of the church at Ephesus to take heed to themselves and to the whole flock, over which the Holy Spirit had appointed them overseers. So too in 1 Timothy 3:2 where he portrays the overseer by the attributes* and effects that the apostle Peter prescribes for his fellow presbyters (1 Peter 5:1–3). And thus in the Epistle to the Philippians 1:1, with the name* of the "overseers" for whom he prays God for his grace, he means those men at Philippi who are in charge of the Word and the governance, and he distinguishes them from the deacons who administered the ecclesiastical coffers. In Titus 1:7 he calls "overseers" those whom he had called "presbyters" in verse 5, not with respect to the "presbyters" as secondary leaders and priests subordinate to them, but with respect to the Church that had been entrusted to their watchful care and oversight. For in the sacred writings they are distinguished as "overseers" not with respect to some authority over Christ's other servants, nor to some prior right over the others, but only with respect to that care and watchfulness.[14]

30 It is not by divine arrangement, therefore, but by a human one that after the times of the apostles someone from the ranks of the presbyters gained authority over the others and was, through special prerogative, called "commander" and "overseer," just as some papal teachers after Jerome profess, namely Lombard, Gratian, Cusanus,[15] and others (Jerome, *To Titus*, chapter 1, and *To Evagrius*; Lombard, book 4, distinction 24; Gratian, distinction 93, chapter "legimus," and distinction 95. chapter "olim;" Cusanus, *The Catholic Concordance*, book 2, chapter 13).

---

14 For the significance of Polyander's equation of 'overseers' (bishops) with 'elders' (presbyters) see thesis 47 below.

15 Nicholas of Cusa, a theologian from Germany, was a proponent of Renaissance humanism and of the conciliar movement in the late medieval church. During the Council of Basel he wrote *De concordantia catholica* (1432), a treatise that argues that consent through representative councils is necessary for legitimate government.

XXXI Ad legitimam Pastorum ordinariorum vocationem, duo potissimum media sunt adhibenda, vocandorum electio, et electorum ordinatio.

XXXII Jus Pastores eligendi, est penes Ecclesiam, ac proinde plebi commune* cum Presbyteris; jus eos ordinandi, soli Presbyterio est proprium.

XXXIII Ideo Pastorum electio olim fiebat per χειροτονίαν atque acclamationem totius plebis, quae audito nomine Pastoris eligendi, suum suffragium presbyterii suffragio consentaneum sublatis manibus indicabat, Act. 14, 23. Ordinatio autem, quae hodie confirmatio nuncupatur, fiebat ab aliquo ex Pastoribus, nomine totius Presbyterii, coram facie Ecclesiae, per χειροθεσίαν, seu manuum impositionem, 1 Tim. 5, 22.

XXXIV Jus illud Pastores eligendi, suoque suffragio Presbyterii de Pastoribus eligendis judicium, aut approbandi, aut improbandi, Ecclesia primitiva aliquandiu ab Apostolorum aetate retinuit, ut patet ex hoc Cypriani testimonio* lib. 1. *Ep*. 4.[a] *Plebs maxime habet potestatem, vel eligendi dignos Sacerdotes, vel indignos recusandi*. Et *Ep*. 68.[b] *Videmus de divina auctoritate descendere, ut Sacerdos, plebe praesente, sub omnium oculis deligatur, et dignus atque idoneus, publico judicio ac testimonio* comprobetur*. Ideo Augustinus postquam Eradium in successorem suum elegisset, Ecclesiam suam rogavit, ut ad Episcopatum eum reciperet.

XXXV Ne autem in Episcopi electione error aliquis toti Ecclesiae perniciosus committeretur, pia antiquitas 1. solemni solebat examine doctrinam ac vitam illius prius explorare, et sicubi idoneis Judicibus destitueretur, Presbyteros ex vicinis Ecclesiis in eum finem* accersere, secundum Canonem Apostoli, 2 Tim. 2, 2. *Haec committe fidis hominibus qui sint idonei ad alios quoque docendos*. 2. nomen illius, ubi id licebat, in tabella perscriptum omnibus publice solebat proponere, ubi vero id non licebat, in coetu Ecclesiastico palam recitare,

[a] Cyprian, *Ep*. 67.3 (CSEL 3A:738). [b] Cyprian, Ep. 67.4 (CSEL 3A:738).

To the lawful calling of ordinary pastors we should apply especially two means; the election of those who are to be called, and the ordination of those who have been elected. 31

The right to elect pastors is in the hands of the Church, and hence it is shared* between the common people and the elders. But the right to ordain them belongs only to the council of elders. 32

And so in olden days the election of the pastors took place by the raising of hands and the vocal acclamation of all the people, who when it heard the name of the pastor who was to be chosen, would indicate by the raising of hands that its vote agreed with the vote of the presbytery (Acts 14:23).[16] But the ordination (which today is called confirmation) was done by one of the pastors on behalf of the whole presbytery in the presence of the entire congregation, by the laying on of hands, or *cheirothesia* (1 Timothy 5:22). 33

For a considerable period of time after the apostolic age the early church retained that right of electing pastors, and by means of its vote to approve or disapprove the presbytery's decision about the pastors who were to be chosen, as is evident from the following testimony* of Cyprian: "The people have the greatest power of electing worthy priests and of rejecting unworthy ones" (Book 1, epistle 4). And: "We see that it comes down from divine authority that the priest is chosen in the presence of the people as they all watch, and that the worthy and suitable one is approved by public decision and witness"* (Epistle 68). Therefore Augustine after having chosen Eradius as his successor asked his church to accept him in the office of overseer.[17] 34

However, lest in the election of overseers some destructive error should be committed against the whole Church, devout antiquity[18] was accustomed 1) to test and probe the doctrine and life of that person, and if there was any place that lacked suitable judges for it, then it would fetch presbyters from the neighboring churches for that purpose,* according to the apostle's rule in 2 Timothy 2:2: "Entrust these things to faithful men who are able to teach them also to others." [The Church] was accustomed 2) where it was permitted, to publish his name written on placards for everyone to see. Where it was not 35

16 I.e., 'presbytery' in the sense of the local council of elders, which Polyander in thesis 37 below identifies as the 'consistory' of his days. See also the note there.

17 Eradius, now most commonly referred to as Eraclius, was a presbyter to the church of Hippo when Augustine chose him as his successor in 426. So that Eraclius might not face troubles as others were whose succession had been shrouded in secrecy, Augustine assembled the people to obtain their consent, and had acts of the proceedings drawn up. See Augustine, *Epistulae* 213 (CSEL 57, 372–374); and Peter Brown, *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography*, 2nd rev. ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 411.

18 *Pia antiquitas* ("devout antiquity") here stands for the early church.

ut si quid vitii, probri, aut scandali, in eo compertum fuisset, illud intra diem praefinitum ad Presbyterium deferretur. Qua circumspectione cautum fuit, ne quis ad sacrum ministerium admitteretur, nisi bonum quoque testimonium* ab extraneis haberet, juxta commonefactionem Apostoli, 1 Tim. 3, 7. Diacono enim proclamante in Ecclesia, licuit omnibus Pastori ordinando aditum ad regimen animarum objicere, si quod aliquando crimen patrasset, ut docet Origenes *Contra Celsum*, lib. 8. sub finem.[a]

XXXVI Uterque piae antiquitatis ritus nobis semper imitandus est, ut ex idoneo atque universali domesticorum fidei testimonio,* toti populo probe constet, Ecclesiae Pastorem accedente ejus suffragio electum et ordinatum, esse irreprehensum atque aptum ad oves Christi pascendas. Neque in Episcoporum tantum et Presbyterorum, sed in Diaconorum quoque ordinationibus ritum utrumque nobis imitandum esse, monet Cyprianus *Epist.* 68.[b]

XXXVII Quamvis Pastores electos ordinandi potestas, seu in ministerio confirmandi, ad totum Presbyterium, quod hodie vocamus Consistorium, pertineat, olim tamen Presbyterium eam ritu τῆς χειροθεσίας, non tam per Seniores qui praecipue praeerant disciplinae, exsequebatur, quam per Pastores, qui imprimis vacabant Prophetiae seu Scripturarum explicationi, earundemque ad usum

[a] Origen, *Contra Celsum* 8 (SC 150:351–352). [b] Cyprian, Ep. 67.4 (CSEL 3A:738).

permitted it was accustomed openly to read his name aloud in a meeting of the church, so that if any vice, disgrace, or scandal were discovered in him, it would be brought to the presbytery before a predetermined day. By means of this precaution it would guard against anyone being admitted to the sacred ministry who did not also have a good testimony* from outsiders, according to the apostle's admonition in 1 Timothy 3:7. For when the deacon made the proclamation in the church, everyone was permitted to raise an objection against the pastor who was going to be ordained in order to have access to their souls' direction, if he had committed some misdeed, as Origen teaches in *Against Celsus*, book 8 (towards the end).

We should always follow both of these practices of devout antiquity, so 36
that on the basis of a suitable, universal testimony* by the members of the household of faith it will be well-established for all the people that the pastor of the church who has been elected and ordained with their supporting vote is above reproach, suited to feeding the sheep of Christ. And moreover, we should follow both rites not only in the ordination of overseers and presbyters, but also of deacons, as Cyprian advises in Epistle 68.[19]

The power to ordain the elected pastors and to confirm them in their min- 37
istry belongs to the whole presbytery (which we today call the consistory).[20] In former times the presbytery still carried out that power through the ritual of the laying-on of hands, not so much by the elders who were in charge especially of discipline, but by the pastors who were free to prophesy or explain

19 Polyander refers to the practice of electing pastors, elders, and deacons and to the period of time for raising objections. This practice was neglected in the Middle Ages, when higher office—rather than the congregation—chose lower office bearers. In the Netherlands the Reformed churches established the practice of election of office bearers in the earliest church orders from the Convent of Wesel (1568) onward. For the background of Dutch church polity principles see Herman J. Selderhuis (ed.), *Handbook of Dutch Church History* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 221–227 and Fred van Lieburg, "Re-Understanding the Dordt Church Order in its Dutch Political, Ecclesiastical and Cultural Context (1559–1816)," in *Protestant Church Polity in Changing Contexts: Ecclesiological and Historical Contributions. Proceedings of the International Conference, Utrecht, The Netherlands, 7–10 November, 2011*, ed. Allan J. Janssen and Leo J. Koffeman (Zürich: LIT-Verlag, 2014), 1:117–136.

20 Polyander here reflects the church-political 'hierarchy' of the continental Reformed tradition: from local consistory, to classis, to provincial (or particular) synod, to general synod. The local body of pastors and elders (presbytery or consistory) has the power to ordain and confirm pastors. In Presbyterianism, the 'presbytery' is more or less equivalent to the Reformed continental classis, and finds itself between the local 'session' and the 'general assembly.' In this disputation presbytery refers to the local consistory (see also theses 62 and 70 below).

fidelium applicationi. Unde Prophetia cum manuum impositione, per quam olim fiebat ordinatio Pastorum, ab Apostolo conjungitur, 1 Tim. 4, 14.

XXXVIII Post tempora Apostolorum Episcopus collegio Presbyterorum praepositus, Pastoribus electis manus plerumque coram facie Ecclesiae primus imponebat, deinde ceteri quoque Presbyteri, secundum Canonem 4. Concil. Carthaginensis:[a] *Presbyter cum ordinatur, Episcopo eum benedicente, et manus super caput ejus tenente, etiam omnes Presbyteri, qui praesentes sunt, manus suas juxta manus Episcopi super caput illius teneant*. Tandem solus Episcopus secundum posteriores Canones Ecclesiasticos (*ut testatur Leo in Epistola ad Episcopos Galliae et Germaniae*)[b] Presbyteros et Diaconos consecrabat.

XXXIX Pastorum electionem, eorumque ordinationem cum toti Presbyterio communem* esse dicimus, ad Ecclesiam jam plene constitutam respicimus. Nam ubi hujusmodi nondum est Ecclesia, ibi negotium illud aliter, pro re nata, geri potest.

XL Antequam haec ad nostrarum Ecclesiarum reformatarum Pastores accommodemus, munus quod obeunt, primitus ac divinitus institutum esse, pro certo ponimus, cum primariae partes sacri ipsorum ministerii, normae omnibus Pastoribus, ab ipso Christo, Matt. 28, 20. et 18, 17. praescriptae, omnino respondeant, cujusmodi sunt pura verbi divini praedicatio secundum Scripturas, legitima Sacramentorum* administratio, recta et sedula disciplinae Ecclesiasticae procuratio.

---

[a] DH 326. [b] *Epistola Leonis Papae de privilegio chorepiscoporum sive presbiterorum ad universos Germanie atque Gallie ecclesiarum episcopos*, in *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae et Capitula Angilramni*, ed. Paul Hinschius (Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1863), 628–629. Officially attributed to Pope Leo I. (c.400–661), this letter is nowadays considered to be a medieval forgery.

the Scriptures and who applied it for the believers' use. For this reason the apostle links prophecy with the laying-on of hands whereby formerly the ordination of the pastors occurred (1 Timothy 4:14).

38 After the times of the apostles the overseer in charge of the college of elders used to be the first to place his hands upon the chosen pastors and most often he did so in the presence of the church; and then the other presbyters would do so too, according to Rule 4 of the Council of Carthage: "When an elder is ordained, as the bishop is blessing him and holding his hands over his head, then also all the other elders who are present will place their hands over his head along with the hands of the bishop." And finally, according to the later ecclesiastical rules it was only the bishop who would consecrate the elders and deacons (as Leo [the First] testifies in the *Epistle to the Bishops of France and Germany*).

39 In stating that the election and ordination of pastors was shared* by the whole presbytery, we have in mind a church that already has been fully instituted. For where a church of this kind does not yet exist, it is possible to conduct this affair in a different way, as the need arises.[21]

40 Before we apply this observation to the pastors in our Reformed churches,[22] we posit as certain that the office they are entering upon was instituted from of old by God, since the foremost duties of their sacred ministry correspond completely to the norm that Christ himself had prescribed for all the pastors (Matthew 28:20; 18:17). And these duties are of the following sort: the pure preaching of the Word of God according to the Scriptures; the lawful administration of the sacraments;* and the right and thorough management of church discipline.[23]

---

21 Polyander goes on to treat two kinds of these exceptional circumstances in the election and ordination of pastors: 1) the first Reformers, who were not always officially ordained (theses 40–43, and the final conclusion in thesis 58); and 2) places where no fully instituted church yet exists (thesis 44).

22 The background to this digression are the polemics with Roman Catholic writers, who questioned the validity of the ministry of the Reformers by pointing out that many of them had never been officially ordained to the ministry. Calvin was a favorite object of this accusation, which was already made against him by Louis du Tillet (c. 1509-?), a former evangelical sympathizer who later returned to the Roman Catholic Church, or by the great polemicist Robert Bellarmine. See George H. Tavard, "Calvin and the Nicodemites," in *John Calvin and Roman Catholicism: Critique and Engagement, Then and Now*, ed. Randal C. Zachmann (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 59–78, 62–69; and Bellarmine, *De membris Ecclesiae* (*De clericis*) 1.3 (*Opera* 2:422a).

23 Cf. the three marks of the true church in Reformed theology (*Belgic Confession*, article 29), as discussed in *SPT* 40.45.

XLI Vocatio primorum quorundam Pastorum orthodoxorum, qui Christi Ecclesias foeda quondam Antichristi idololatria diraque tyrannide deformatas admirabili zelo, fide, et industria reformarunt, partim fuit ordinaria, partim extraordinaria. Ordinaria, quatenus ad eam fuerunt, aut in Romana, aut in Ecclesia aliqua reformata, ordinati. Extraordinaria, quatenus ut malo extraordinario remedium extraordinarium afferrent, extraordinariis ad illam functionem dotibus instructi fuerunt.

XLII Si vero ex illis aliqui in principio reformationis absque praevia certae cujusdam Ecclesiae vocatione Evangelium Christi plebi ipsis reclamanti annunciarunt, illi eodem spiritu ad illud opus sacri Ministerii acti fuerunt, quo olim Apollos, Cyprii et Cyrenaei, qui olim in Judaeorum Synagogis et coram Gentibus mysteria Jesu Christi praedicasse dicuntur, Act. 11. et 18. tametsi aut a Judaeis, aut a Gentibus, aut ab Apostolis, aut Evangelistis ad illud munus fuisse ordinatos, nusquam legatur.

XLIII Interim sicuti illi, accedente postea Apostolorum approbatione, per Barnabam aliosque Christi discipulos in isto munere inchoato fuerunt sollemniter confirmati, teste Luca, Act. 11, 23. et 18, 27. sic *Origenes* alicui in urbe in qua nullus est Christianus, Evangelizanti contingere posse asseverat, ut postmodum communi* auditorum quos ad Christum convertit, suffragio, Episcopus ordinetur, *Homil.* 11. *in* 18. *Num.*[a]

XLIV Et sane ubi nulla est Ecclesia, ibi viris a Deo ad Evangelizandum missis, non est ab hominibus Deum ignorantium exspectanda vocatio, sed Deo mittenti immediate* obtemperandum, ex communi* obligatione ad regnum ipsius pro occasione oblata promovendum, donec tum Ecclesiae ab ipsis colligendae, tum fratrum vicinorum, aut remotorum consensu, in inchoata functione stabiliantur.

XLV Donum miraculorum, nec vocationis prorsus extraordinariae, nec mixtae, id est, partim ordinariae, partim extraordinariae, necessarium est adjunctum. Nam *Abdias, Micheas, Oseas, Zacharias*, quorum vocatio fuit extraordinaria,

[a] Origen, *In Numeros homiliae* 11.4,5 (SC 442:42).

The calling of some of the first orthodox pastors, who with marvelous zeal, 41
trust, and hard work reformed Christ's churches that once had been deformed by the filthy idolatry and dreadful tyranny of the Antichrist, was partly ordinary and partly extraordinary. It was ordinary insofar as they had been ordained to that calling in either the Romanist or the Reformed church. It was extraordinary insofar as they had been equipped with extraordinary talents for that task of bringing extraordinary remedies to an extraordinary wrongdoing.

But if some of them at the start of the Reformation, and without a prior 42
calling from a certain church, proclaimed the Gospel of Christ to people who were crying out to them, it was the same Spirit who drove them to that work of sacred ministry whereby formerly Apollos, the Cyprian and Cyrenaean men are said to have preached the mysteries of Christ in the synagogues of the Jews and to the gentiles (Acts 11:18)—even though one reads nowhere that the gentiles, apostles, or evangelists had ordained them to that office.

And meanwhile, in the same manner as it was with the subsequent approval 43
of the apostles that those men were solemnly confirmed in that not yet fully formed office by Barnabas and Christ's other disciples (as Luke testifies in Acts 11:23, and 18:27), so also Origen asserts that it can happen that someone who is bringing the Gospel in a city where no Christian is living is ordained afterwards as overseer by the general* vote of the hearers whom he converts to Christ (*Homily* 11 on Numbers 18).

And surely, in a place where there is no church, there the men whom God 44
has sent to bring the Gospel should not expect to receive a calling from people who do not know God, but they should be obedient directly* to God who sends them, based on the general* duty to advance his kingdom as the opportunity allows, until such time as they are well-established in their still undeveloped function in the church that they are going to gather, with the agreement of the neighboring (or further removed) brothers.[24]

It is not necessary that the gift of performing miracles must accompany 45
either the entirely extraordinary calling or the mixed one (i.e., partly ordinary, partly extraordinary).[25] For Obadiah, Micah, Hosea, and Zechariah, whose

24 Polyander here reflects the church order of Dort (1619) which, like earlier church orders produced by the Reformed in the Low Countries, made provisions for places where no fully instituted church as yet existed. In such cases, the classis (cf. 'neighboring brothers') became involved; see *Church Order of Dort* (*1619*), articles 38–39, in *Kercken-ordeninghe, ghestelt in den Nationalen Synode der Ghereformeerde kercken* (Arnhem: Jan Janszoon, 1620). An English edition is available in DeRidder, *Church Orders*, 546–557.

25 In his discussion of the miracles as a mark of the church Bellarmine states that miracles are necessary for the confirmation of an extraordinary mission, *De conciliis* 4.13 (*Opera*

suam doctrinam miraculis non confirmarunt, nec *Johannes Baptista*, cujus vocationem aliqua ratione mixtam fuisse ex eo apparet, quod secundum ordinem Aaronis, ex cujus erat tribu, patris sui successor fuerit legitimus docendi potestate praeditus et secundum spiritum Eliae sibi communicatum, Minister ac praecursor Christi extraordinarius.

XLVI Multi e contrario Pseudoprophetae miracula edituri dicuntur: in quorum numero, ne veri Prophetae nostri seculi a caeco populo collocarentur, Deus eos aliis potius donis adversus hostes suae veritatis, quam dono miraculorum armare voluit. Invictae enim fortitudinis suae constantia Ecclesias ab Antichristi tyrannide, ac veritatem doctrinae Evangelicae ab illius erroribus asseruerunt, innumerasque oves ab Antichristi emissariis seductas ad Christi ovile aggregarunt.

XLVII Quamvis pauci ex prioribus nostrarum Ecclesiarum Pastoribus ab Episcopis, plerique ex recentioribus a Presbyteris sint ordinati, non minus tamen legitima est horum, quam illorum vocatio, quoniam Episcopi et Presbyteri re olim et munere iidem fuerunt, ut Thes. 29. docuimus; ac proinde ex jure divino eadem fuit utrorumque ad Pastores ordinandos auctoritas.

XLVIII Vocationis illorum qui in Pontificiorum Ecclesia sunt ordinati, tres causae* diversae sunt considerandae, una principalis, nimirum Deus, duae minus principales, Pontificiorum scilicet, Ecclesia et Episcopus. Quatenus nomine Ecclesiae Romanae adulterinae ab aliquo Episcopo ordinati sunt secundum normam institutionis divinae, ut Evangelium Christi praedicarent, ejusque Sacramenta* administrarent, eatenus pura est ac legitima eorum ordinatio. Quatenus vero ab eodem Episcopo sunt ordinati, ut secundum statuta Pontificis Romani humanas traditiones Laicis pro divinis obtruderent, Christi corpus Deo in Missa commentitia offerrent, eatenus impura et illegitima est eorum vocatio, ac similis aquae ex puro fonte emananti, quae ex impuro canali per quem fluit, sordes suas contraxit.

XLIX Pastorum ordinariorum duplex est successio personalis,* aut continuata a primaeva verorum antecessorum ordinatione, aut interrupta. Priorem succes-

---

2:396b). Rivetus discusses the question whether in every extraordinary call miracles are required in his commentary on Exodus 4; see Rivetus, *Opera* 1:787a.

calling was extraordinary, did not confirm their own teaching with miracles. Nor did John the Baptist, who had a calling that was in a way mixed, as is evident from the fact that he was the lawful successor to his father according to the order of Aaron (from whose tribe he came), and because he was endowed with the power to teach, and being an extraordinary minister and forerunner of Christ by virtue of the spirit of Elijah that had been imparted to him.

On the other hand, it is said that miracles were performed by many false 46
prophets. And so that the unperceiving populace would not number the true prophets of our times among them, God willed to equip ministers against the enemies of his truth with gifts other than the gift of performing miracles. For it was by their steadfast fortitude that they guarded the churches against the tyranny of the Antichrist, and guarded the truth of the Gospel-teaching against his errors, and they added countless sheep to Christ's flock, sheep whom the emissaries of the Antichrist had led astray.

Although a few of the first pastors of our churches were in fact ordained by 47
bishops while the majority of the more recent ones were ordained by presbyters, nevertheless the calling of the latter is no less lawful than that of the former, because the bishops and presbyters formerly held the same office, as we have taught in thesis 29; and so by divine right both of them had the authority to ordain pastors.[26]

We should consider that there are three separate causes* for the calling of 48
those who have been ordained in the Roman Catholic Church. One of them is fundamental, namely: God. Two are less fundamental, namely the Roman Catholic Church and bishop. Insofar as it is according to the norm of the divine institution to preach Christ's Gospel and to administer his sacraments* that they have been ordained in the name of the unfaithful Romanist church by some bishop, to such an extent is their ordination pure and lawful. But insofar as the same bishop has ordained them so that it is according to the Roman pontiff's orders that they foist upon the laity human traditions as though they are divine and offer to God the body of Christ in this false mass, to that extent their calling is impure and unlawful—like water issuing from a pure fountain that picks up its filth from the impure channel through which it flows.

The personal* succession of ordinary pastors is twofold: either one that 49
continued from the primeval ordination of true predecessors, or an interrupted

26 The underlying argument is that, according to Roman Catholic controversialists, a number of the first Reformers had not been ordained by bishops but by presbyters, although the latter had no right of ordination. See, for example, Bellarmine, *De membris Ecclesiae* (*De clericis*) 1.3 (*Opera* 2.422a). Polyander's earlier equation of 'overseers' (or bishops) and 'elders' (or presbyters) in thesis 29 above therefore undermines the force of this argument.

sionem Antichristus in templum Dei irrumpens plerisque ex nostris antecessoribus, jam pridem variis in locis eripuit. Posterior quibusbam attribui potest. Non enim omnes proxime et immediate* orthodoxis superiorum aetatum Doctoribus, sed nonnulli post subsecutorum Antichristi errorum, ejusque mercenariorum rejectionem in Ecclesia Christi, accedente pii Magistratus auxilio, ad eam ab ipsorum corruptelis repurgandam successerunt. Non secus atque in regno a Tyranno ejusque praedonibus liberato, posteriores legitimi Regis administri, prioribus, decurso intermedio tyrannidis spatio, ad illud instaurandum surrogantur, aut sicuti in corpore aegri convalescentis posterior sanitas priorem, sublato prius subsecutae luis contagio, sequitur.

L Non ergo ex continuatione successionis personalis,* sed verae doctrinae, boni Pastores a mercenariis ac latronibus, neque ex successionis personalis,* sed purae praedicationis interruptione, mercenarii ac latrones a bonis Pastoribus dignosci debent.

LI Mercenarii enim ac latrones prioris doctrinae Orthodoxae cursum in Ecclesiis, quas invaserant, interrumpentes, eodem modo Patribus orthodoxis successerunt, quo interdum Tyranni ac praedones in Republica, legitimo Regi ejusque administris, aut in ovili, lupi Pastoribus, aut in corpore aegri, sanitati morbus, et vitae mors succedit.

LII In horum mercenariorum principe, qui se Apostoli Petri successorem nominat, nullum successionis in Apostolatum ipsius vestigium apparet.

LIII Petri enim vocatio fuit extraordinaria omni carens successione. Nam nulli Provinciam ac curam docendi omnes Gentes, ante obitum suum delegavit. At Romani Pontificis vocatio est ordinaria, ejusdemque Monarchiae continuatio, qua novus Papa in prioris demortui Cathedram Monarchicam succedit.

LIV Petrus, ut omnes Gentes secundum Christi mandatum doceret, varias regiones peragrasse legitur, Act. 10. et seqq. Pontifex autem Romanus soli Cathe-

one. It was already long ago now that in various places the first kind of succession was snatched away from most of our predecessors by the Antichrist when he burst into the temple of God. The second kind of succession can be applied to some pastors. For not all ministers succeeded the orthodox teachers of former times closely and immediately,* but some came after the subsequent errors of the Antichrist and his hirelings were rejected from Christ's Church (with the support of a devout civil magistrate), in order to cleanse it from their perverse influences. It is similar to a kingdom that has been set free from a tyrant and his henchmen, when later servants of the lawful king replaced the earlier ones to restore that kingdom (when a space of time ran its course after the tyranny). Or it is like the later good health that follows upon the earlier one in the sick body of an ill man who is recovering, after the contagion of the subsequent illness has first been taken away.

And so it is not by the continuity of personal* succession that we must 50
tell the good shepherds from hirelings and robbers,[27] but by the continuity of true teaching; nor is it by the interruption of personal* succession but by the interruption of the pure preaching that we must know hirelings and robbers from good shepherds.[28]

For the hirelings and robbers who had interrupted the course of the former 51
orthodox teaching in the churches they had invaded, succeeded the orthodox fathers in the same way that sometimes in a republic tyrants and their henchmen take the place of a legitimate king and his servants, or as when wolves replace the shepherds of a flock, or a disease replaces good health in a sick body, and death replaces life.

Not a single trace of his succession to apostleship is evident in the leader of 52
those hirelings who does call himself the apostle Peter's successor.

For Peter's calling was an extraordinary one that didn't have any succession 53
whatsoever. For before he died, Peter did not pass on to anyone his jurisdiction and concern for teaching all the gentiles. But the calling of the Roman pontiff is an ordinary one, like the continuation of a monarchy, in which the new pope accedes to the monarchic seat of his defunct predecessors.

In Acts 10 and following, one reads that Peter traveled throughout various 54
regions in order to teach all the gentiles, according to the command of Christ.

---

27 John 10:8.

28 For John Calvin, personal apostolic succession was not very important, because the real apostolic succession lies in the preserving of the apostolic truth (*Institutes* 4.2.2). Polyander seems to give the personal succession comparatively more importance by stressing that some Reformed pastors had been ordained in the Roman Catholic Church (thesis 48) and by arguing for an interrupted succession (thesis 49).

drae atque urbi Romanae alligatus, nunquam ex ea ad exteras nationes docendas egreditur.

LV Petrus ab ipso Christo Episcoporum Principe immediate* ad munus suum fuit vocatus: Romanus vero Pontifex a Cardinalibus sibi subordinatis ad suum Pontificatum promovetur.

LVI Petrus viva voce* Evangelium Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi aliis annunciavit. Hic instar statuae elinguis atque inutilis ad docendum, ut κωφὸν πρόσωπον, sedem suam Pontificalem occupat.

LVII Quemadmodum Petrus munus suum Apostolicum sibi suisque coapostolis, sic munus suum Episcopale eadem ratione qua Paulus Act. 20, 28, sibi ceterisque Ecclesiae Pastoribus communiter attribuit, dum eos suos συνπρεσβυτέρους appellat, 1 Pet. 5, 1. Sed Pontifex Romanus summum Episcopatum sibi singulariter vendicans, se Episcoporum ac Pastorum in Ecclesia docentium ordine prorsus excludit.

LVIII Si quis reliquam Patriarcharum, Cardinalium, Archiepiscoporum et Canonicorum Pontificiorum hierarchiam consideret, non minorem differentiam inter eos et Evangelii administros a Paulo Eph. 4. enumeratos, quam inter Pontificem Romanum et Petrum, animadvertet. Nam sicuti illi ne nomine quidem tenus in Pauli catalogo reperiuntur, sic neque dignitatum atque auctoritatis inaequalitas, qua superiorum clericorum ordinatio ab inferiorum ordinatione distinguitur, ullo aut Apostolorum, aut reliquorum Evangelii praeconum exemplo nititur, ut supra Thes. 29. et seq. demonstravimus. Ex quibus omnibus vocationem Pastorum Ecclesiae Christi reformatae inservientium legitimam, Pontificis vero Sacerdotumque ipsi subordinatorum, ut nomine ipsius Clero dominentur, illegitimam esse concludimus.

LIX A Pastoribus de quibus hactenus dictum est, Seniores Ecclesiae, olim quoque Presbyteri appellati, sunt distinguendi, ut patet ex Rom. 12, 8. ubi Apostolus eos qui praesunt in Ecclesia, ab iis discernit, qui aut in ea docent, quos Eph. 4, 11. Doctores, aut in ea quoslibet praeterea ad fidei obedientiam adhortantur, quos ibidem Pastores nuncupat. Quam distinctionem Apostolus multo facit evidentius,* 1 Tim. 5, 17. cum ait, *Qui bene praesunt presbyteri, duplici honore digni habentur, maxime qui laborant in sermone et doctrina.*

LX Hac enim limitatione Apostolus duo Presbyterorum genera constituit. 1. Eorum qui in sacrae doctrinae explicatione atque ad usum populi, tam publica quam privata applicatione maximopere desudabant. 2. Eorum qui vacantes

But the Roman pontiff is 'tied' to his papal chair and the city of Rome, and never departs from it to teach foreign nations.

Peter was called to his office immediately* by Christ himself, as chief of the overseers, but the Roman pontiff is promoted to his pontificate by the cardinals who are subordinate to him. 55

It is with his own voice* that Peter declared the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ to others. But this one is seated in his own pontiff's chair like a sculpture that has no tongue, and is useless for teaching, like a mute character.[29] 56

In the same way that Peter applied his own apostolic office to his co-apostles and himself, so he also attributes his own office of overseer to the other pastors of the Church together with himself (in the same way as Paul in Acts 20:28) when he calls them his fellow-presbyters (1 Peter 5:1). But the Roman pontiff insists on his highest episcopate singly for himself, and he excludes himself entirely from the rank of overseers and pastors who teach in the Church. 57

If one were to look at the other hierarchy of patriarchs, cardinals, archbishops, and canon priests, he would notice a difference between them and those who minister the Gospel as listed by Paul in Ephesians 4[:11] that is as great as the one between the Roman pontiff and Peter. For just as those men do not appear even in Paul's list in name, so the inequality of positions and authority whereby the ranking of superior clerics is distinguished from that of the inferior ones does not rest upon any example given by the apostles or the other preachers of the Gospel, as we have shown above, in thesis 29 and following. From all these things we conclude that the calling of the pastors who serve the Reformed Church of Christ is a lawful one, but that of the pontiff and the priests under him (as they rule the clerical order on his behalf) is not lawful. 58

We should make a distinction between the pastors about whom we have spoken until now and the elders of the Church (who formerly were also called presbyters), as is clear from Romans 12:8, where the apostle distinguished those who were in charge of the Church from those who either taught in it (whom he calls teachers in Ephesians 4:11) or who also exhorted everyone to the obedience of the faith (whom he there calls pastors). The apostle makes that distinction much more obvious* in 1 Timothy 5:17, when he says, "Let those elders who rule well be worthy of a double honor, especially those who labor in preaching and teaching." 59

For by means of this limitation the apostle established two types of elders: 1) Those who labored with great endeavor over the explanation of sacred doctrine and its application (publicly and privately) for use by the people. 2) Those who 60

29 The term "silent mask" (*kōphon prosōpon*) comes from the realm of Greek tragedy and denotes an additional, silent role played by one of the actors.

disciplinae, id solum curabant ut omnia fierent in Ecclesia rite ac decore, omniaque offendicula ex sinu illius tollerentur. Unde horum functio ab Apostolo gubernatio vocatur, 1Cor. 12, 28. Neque hic admittenda est insulsa quorundam ad locum 1Tim. 5, 17. exceptio, voce* κοπιῶντες, discerni Pastores diligentius laborantes a negligentius laborantibus. Nam praeterquam quod participium κοπιῶντες, non ad praecedens vocabulum, *Presbyteri*, sed ad sequentia refertur, *in sermone et doctrina*, ex ipsorum interpretatione sequeretur, eos, qui negligentius laborant in sermone et doctrina, duplici quoque honore dignos esse. Quo nihil absurdius statui potest, nec a mente Apostoli alienius, qui summam ab omnibus Episcopis seu Pastoribus vigilantiam efflagitat, 1Tim. 3, 3. Unde negligentiores Pastores duplici potius censura dignos esse rectius concludimus.

LXI Horum officium est se in disciplinae administratione Pastoribus adjungere, causas ad Presbyterii cognitionem pertinentes ex legibus veritatis, prudentiae ac caritatis cum iis dijudicare, non minus Pastorum et Collegarum suorum, quam totius plebis Religionem* ac mores observare, quoslibet errantes ad Christi ovile revocare, delinquentes officii admonere, et contumaces ad Consistorium deferre, ut gliscenti malo ac scandalo censuris suis Ecclesiasticis mature occurrant.

LXII Si malo oborto aut ab errante in doctrina, aut a peccante adversus Dei atque Ecclesiae disciplinam, in Presbyterio aptum promptumque remedium afferri nequeat, in Classicalem aut Synodicum conventum rejici poterit, ut illud adhibita subsidiaria aliorum Pastorum ac Presbyterorum opera, prorsus sopiatur. Qua in re* Ecclesiarum nostrarum presbyteri vestigiis presbyterorum Ecclesiae Antiochenae insistent, Act. 15, 2.

spent their time in disciplining, and who had concern only for the fact that everything be done in the Church in a right and decent manner, and that all cases for offense be removed from the Church's heart. Hence the apostle calls their function government (1 Corinthians 12:28).[30] Nor should we here allow entry to the foolish objection that some make at 1 Timothy 5:17, i.e., that with the word* "laboring" the more hard-working pastors are distinguished from those who work more carelessly.[31] For besides the fact that the participle "laboring" refers not to the preceding word "elders" but to what follows, "in preaching and teaching," it would follow from their explanation that those who labor more negligently in preaching and teaching are worthy of a double honor also. Nothing more silly than that could possibly be stated, nor anything more foreign to the mind of the apostle, who demands the highest vigilance from all the overseers or pastors (1 Timothy 3:3). Hence we conclude more correctly that the more negligent pastors are worthy of double censure instead.

The duty of these men is to work in conjunction with the pastors in administering discipline, and together with them to pass judgment in cases pertaining to the judicial examination of the presbytery, based on the laws of truth, wisdom and love. They are to keep an eye on the worship* and moral behavior of the pastors and their own colleagues no less than that of all the people, to call back to Christ's flock whoever may be wandering, to reprimand those who are remiss in their duties, and to hand over the obstinate to the consistory, and in a timely manner resist any evil or scandal that arises by means of their ecclesiastical censure. 61

Should it not be possible in the presbytery[32] to bring to bear a suitable and timely remedy to some wrongdoing that has arisen, either by someone who erred in doctrine or by someone who sinned against the discipline of God and the Church, the matter could be brought before a classical or synodical meeting, to settle it completely by applying the supportive help of other pastors and presbyters. In this case* the elders of our churches should follow in the footsteps of the elders of the churches at Antioch (Acts 15:2). 62

30 See for this distinction Calvin, *Institutes* 4.11.1.

31 The "some" cannot been identified with certainty, but Thomas Bilson (1547–1616), the Bishop of Worcester, for instance, remarks that the participle "laboring" (*kopiōntes*) refers to those who weary themselves with laboring and thus are worthy of double honor compared to those who merely work. He uses this as an argument against the defense of lay elders from this text. See Thomas Bilson, *De perpetua ecclesiae Christi gubernatione* (London: Bill, 1611), 182; cf. Thomas Bilson, *The Perpetual Government of Christ's Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1842), 190.

32 See note 20 above.

LXIII Olim Apostolorum hortatu Ecclesia Christiana presbyteris diaconos adjunxit aerarii Ecclesiastici custodes ac Oeconomos, ut quorumlibet, pauperum, sanorum et aegrorum, domesticorum et peregrinorum, liberorum ac captivorum usibus succurrerent, Act. 5, 15. ad quorum subsidiariam curam et operam, piae quoque viduae sexagenariae, dictae Diaconissae, admittebantur, 1 Tim. 5, 9.

LXIV Ut Pastorum et Presbyterorum, sic Diaconorum quoque functio et vita canonibus Apostolicis definitur, Rom. 12. 1 Tim. 3.

LXV Sacramentorum* administratio non minus Pastoribus est propria, quam verbi praedicatio. Nusquam enim Apostoli, aut Presbyteris, quos vulgus hodie seniores appellat, aut Diaconis, docendi Sacramentaque administrandi munus imposuerunt, aut a suis successoribus imponi voluerunt; sed illud solis Pastoribus et Doctoribus juxta Christi institutionem assignatur, Matt. 28, 20. Act. 6, 4. Eph. 4, 11. 1 Tim. 3, 2. 1 Pet. 5, 1. 2.

LXVI Quae de Stephani praedicatione ac baptismo Philippi Diaconi ex Actor. 7. et 8. nobis objiciuntur, non sunt exempla officii ordinarii auctoritate Apostolica confirmati, sed zeli factique extraordinarii. Neuter enim ab Apostolis, aut ab Ecclesiae ex qua egressi sunt episcopis ac presbyteris, ad evangelizandum eodem modo ac ritu dimissus est, quo ab Episcopis Ecclesiae Antiochenae peculiari Spiritus Sancti oraculo admonitis, Paulus et Barnabas dimissi dicuntur, postquam scilicet iis manus in signum emissionis ad vicinas Ecclesias pascendas imposuissent, Act. 13, 3.

LXVII Nec Stephanus coram suis hostibus pertinacibus conciones habuit, sed unicam tantum orationem apologeticam. Nec Philippus ex proprio suo, aut alieno consilio humano, sed ex singulari Dei delegatione coelesti sibi ab eodem Spiritu Dei revelata, Hierosolymis in Samariam abire, atque inde ad Eunuchum docendum et baptizandum proficisci voluit, a quo postea Azotum usque miraculose abreptus fuit, Act. 8, 5. 27. 39. 40.

LXVIII Nugantur ergo Sociniani, cum ex istorum Diaconorum exemplis extraordinariis concludunt, posse aliquem ex Diaconis ordinariis sine Ecclesiae

In former times, at the prompting of the apostles, the Christian Church 63
added deacons (keepers and managers of the ecclesiastical coffers) to the presbyters, in order that they should come to the aid of anyone at all, the poor, the healthy and sick, native and foreign, free men and slaves (Acts 5:15). And to the supportive care and help of these people also sixty-year old devout widows, called "deaconesses," were added (1 Timothy 5:9).

Like the pastors and elders, so too deacons' function and life are defined by 64
apostolic rules (Romans 12:1; 1 Timothy 3).

The administration of the sacraments* is no less specific to the pastors than 65
the preaching of the Word is. For nowhere have the apostles wanted to impose the task of teaching and administering the sacraments upon the presbyters (who are commonly called elders nowadays), or upon the deacons, nor did they wish their own successors to do so; they have assigned that duty to the pastors and teachers only, according to the institution of Christ (Matthew 28:20; Acts 6:4; Ephesians 4:11; 1 Timothy 3:2; 1 Peter 5:1–2).

The objection that is raised against us concerning the preaching of Stephen 66
and the baptism of Philip the deacon in Acts 7 and 8 is not of instances of an ordinary office confirmed by apostolic authority but of exceptional zeal and deeds.[33] For neither of them was sent forth by the apostles, nor by the overseers and presbyters of a church from which they set out in the same manner and ceremony whereby Acts 13:3 says that Paul and Barnabas were sent out by the overseers of the church at Antioch when they were ordered by a special oracle from the Holy Spirit—namely, after those overseers had placed their hands upon them as a sign of sending them forth to pastor the neighboring churches.

Stephen, too, did not hold sermons for his hard-hearted opponents, but only 67
one single speech of defense. Nor was it of his own or some other human devising, but by a special assignment by God from heaven that was revealed to him by the same Spirit of God, that Philip wanted to go from Jerusalem to Samaria and to set out from there in order to teach and baptize the eunuch, and by Whom he was then miraculously snatched away to Azotus (Acts 8:5, 27, 39–40).

Therefore the Socinians are talking nonsense when they draw the conclu- 68
sion from the examples of these extraordinary deacons that any of the ordinary deacons is able to preach the Gospel and administer the sacraments* even

33 The source for this objection could not be determined with certainty, but Stephen and Philip are mentioned by the Socinians as examples to defend the preaching and administration of the sacraments by those who were not ordained. See the references in thesis 69 below.

vocatione, tunc etiam cum ordo in ea servatur, et a doctrina recepta non receditur, Evangelium praedicare, ac Sacramenta* administrare.

LXIX Idem se spiritu contradictionis ac vertiginis agitari ostendunt, dum opus officii pastoralis, ad quod non nisi ad Ecclesiam Dei pascendam idoneos, juxta canones a se praescriptos, admitti vult Apostolus, 1 Tim. 3. et Tit. 1. opus caritatis nuncupant, quod quilibet in Ecclesia exercere possit, ministrosque respectu dispensatorum ab illis Sacramentorum* verbi divini cooperarios appellari negant. Nam praeterquam quod ex Apostolorum atque aliorum pastorum missione, usque ad finem mundi juxta Christi promissionem duratura, falsi redargui possunt, Deum qui per Apostolum jubet, ut omnia fiant in Ecclesia Dei ordine et decenter, 1 Cor. 14, 40 τῆς ἀκαταστασίας, seu incompositi status, a quo maxime abhorret, teste Apostolo, 1 Cor. 14, 33. auctorem atque approbatorem faciunt. Socin. *De Ecclesia*.[a] Ostorod. *Instit.* cap. 42.[b] Nicol. *Circa finem defens.*[c] Soc. Smalc. *Disp. de Minist.*[d]

LXX Cum non minus ad Presbyterorum ac Diaconorum, quam ad Pastorum electionem, Magistratus ac populi eandem fidem cum Presbyterio profitentis, consensus requiratur, peccant Pontificii, qui nec magistratus, nec populi Christiani suffragium ad Ecclesiasticorum suorum electionem admittunt. Vocatio enim eorum qui operam suam toti Ecclesiae consecrant, totius ecclesiae consensu approbari debet, ne minister aliquis ineptus, aut ingratus ei obtrudatur.

LXXI Interim, sicuti Matthias ad apostolatum et diaconi ad diaconiam, praeeuntibus Apostolis, totius Ecclesiae priscae consensu electi fuerunt, sic, si ordine saltem praecedente presbyterii cognitione atque electione, pii Magistratus primo loco, ut custodes utriusque tabulae mandatorum Dei, atque ipsius Ecclesiae nutricii seu conservatores: deinde reliqui ex plebe, ut ejusdem Ecclesiae domestici, presbyterii electioni suum quoque calculum adjiciant, omnibus numeris completa erit ministri futuri vocatio atque ordinatio.

LXXII Non solum pastorum, sed et presbyterorum quoque et diaconorum functio olim fuit perpetua. Nunc quia minor est in nostris, quam fuit olim in Apostolicis

---

[a] Faustus Socinus, *Tractatus de ecclesia*, 14–18. [b] Christoph Ostorodt, *Unterrichtung*, 440–442. [c] [Valentinus Smalcius], *Defensio de Ecclesia*, 167–184. [d] The reference might be to disputation 5 "De ministerio ecclesiastico" in Valentinus Smalcius, *Refutatio thesium D. Wolfgangi Frantzii: De præcipuis Christianæ religionis capitibus anno 1609, & 1610 disputandas proposuit* (Racow: Sternacianis, 1614).

though he does not have a calling from a church (even when order is preserved in [the Church] and there is no departure from accepted teaching).

The same Socinians make it clear that they are being driven by an attitude of 69
polemics and change, when they call the work of the pastoral office (whereto the apostle wants only those admitted who are suited to feeding God's flock, and by the rules which he had prescribed in 1Timothy 3, Titus 1) a work of love that any one at all is able to practice in the Church, and when they deny that the servants are called fellow-workers of the Word of God with a view to the sacraments* that they dispense. For besides the fact that they can be convinced of their error by the mission of the apostles and the other pastors which by Christ's promise will last until the end of the world, they make God who gives the command through the apostle that everything be done decently and in good order in the Church of God (1Corinthians 14:40) into the author and promoter of confusion (*akatastasia*), something that He especially abhors, according to the apostle in 1Corinthians 14:40 (Socinus, *On the Church*; Ostorodt, *Institutes*, chapter 42; Nicolaides, near the end of his, *Defense* [*of Socinus's Treatise on the Church*]; Smalcius, "Disputation [on the Ecclesiastical] Ministry").

Since the consensus of the civil magistrate and of the people who profess the 70
same faith as the presbytery[34] is required for the election of elders and deacons no less than for the pastors, the papal teachers commit sin when they permit neither the magistrate nor the Christian people to vote in the election of their ecclesiastical offices.[35] For the calling of those who dedicate their efforts to the entire Church ought to be approved by the consensus of the whole Church, lest some inept or unsavory minister force himself upon it.

Meanwhile, just as Matthias was elected to his apostleship—and the dea- 71
cons to their diaconate—by the consensus of the whole early church with the apostles leading them, so too will the calling and ordination of future ministers be complete in every respect if the following order at least is kept: the presbytery's enquiry and choice precedes; then in the first place come the devout civil magistrates (as those who keep both tables of God's laws, and who foster or preserve that church); and thereupon the rest of the people as members of the church's household shall add also their vote to the presbytery's choice.

In former times the function of not only the pastors, but also the deacons 72
as well as the elders, was continuous. But because the number of men who

34 See note 20 above.

35 On the consent of the civil magistrate for the ordination of the office bearers elected by the church see also *SPT* 50.52–54. At the background of this civil consent stand the discussions at the Synod of Dort regarding secular patronage of ministers of the local churches.

Ecclesiis, virorum zelo domus Dei aedificandae, aliisque donis spiritualibus eximie ornatorum numerus, ac minor hujus, quam prisci aevi, in eos qui Ecclesiae Christi inserviunt, munificentia, ideo admittitur potius, quam culpatur hodie a nobis continuae presbyterorum ac diaconorum functionis in biennem mutatio: praesertim quod aliqua ex parte similia λειτουργίας interruptae exempla reperiantur in Sacerdotibus ac Levitis Veteris Testamenti, 2 Chron. 24, 4. atque in Zacharia patre Johannis Baptistae, Luc. 1, 5.

LXXIII Et quamvis presbyteri ac diaconi longiore intervallo suum ministerium hodie intermittant, quam olim Sacerdotes ac Levitae, qui certis hebdomadum vicibus munus suum obibant; in eo tamen laudanda est Ecclesiarum nostrarum consuetudo, quod probatae fidei atque integritatis presbyteros ac diaconos decurso paucorum annorum spatio, in functiones praecedentes restituant.

LXXIV Temporibus Apostolorum non tantum presbyteri, sed etiam diaconi sic Ecclesiae Dei olim consecrabantur, ut spectata ipsorum probitate atque in mysteriis fidei explicandis industria ad ministerium pastorale promoverentur, 1 Tim. 3, 13. Unde colligimus, ab antiquis in presbyterorum ac diaconorum electione, non tantummodo puram ipsorum conscientiam, prout in nostris plerumque fit Consistoriis; sed solidam quoque ipsorum scientiam,* atque ad alios ubi res posceret, erudiendos officiique commonefaciendos, industriam fuisse consideratam.

LXXV Nomina* atque officia Ostiariorum, Exorcistarum, Lectorum, Acoluthorum, et Subdiaconorum, non magis in Apostolicis Ministrorum Ecclesiasticorum descriptionibus supra productis comparent, quam epitheta ac munera Archidiaconorum, Curionum, Monachorum, Abbatum, et cetera, quae Thes. 58. recensuimus.

have been equipped with exceptional zeal and other spiritual gifts for building God's house in our churches is less now than it once was in the apostolic churches, and the generosity towards those who serve Christ's Church is less in the current age than the former one, we therefore nowadays allow (rather than censure) the change in the elders' and deacons' continuous function to a biennial one.[36] We allow it especially because to some extent similar examples of interrupted ecclesiastical service occur among the priests and Levites of the Old Testament (2 Chronicles 24:4), as well as in the case of Zechariah, the father of John the Baptist (Luke 1:5).

73 And although nowadays the elders and deacons break up their service with a longer pause than the priests and Levites in former times, who took turns over several weeks performing their office, yet the practice in our churches is commendable, namely that they restore to their former functions the elders and deacons of proven faith and integrity after a space of a few years.[37]

74 During the time of the apostles not only the elders but even the deacons were once consecrated in God's Church in such a way that when people saw their upright character and their diligence in explaining the mysteries of the faith, they would be promoted to the pastoral ministry (1 Timothy 3:13). From this we gather that in the election of the elders and deacons the ancients considered not only their pure consciences (as happens most often in our consistories, too) but also their solid understanding* and diligence in teaching others when the circumstances require it, and in reproving them in their duty.

75 And the names* and offices of Porters, Exorcists, Lectors, Acolytes, and Subdeacons[38] do not appear in the apostolic descriptions of the ecclesiastical servants any more than the titles and duties of the Archdeacons, Heads of the Curia, Monks, Abbots, etc.,[39] which we reviewed in Thesis 58.

---

36 The church order of Dort says that the elders and deacons should serve for two years and that every year half of them shall be replaced by others, unless it is necessary to do otherwise for the profit of the churches, *Church Order of Dort*, article 27. After the synod, however, every Dutch province had its own church order in which practical regulations largely differed.

37 Generally the office-bearers could be re-elected after having not served for a certain period. For a discussion of the issue see Gisbertus Voetius, *Politica ecclesiastica*, 3 vols. (Amsterdam: Van Waesberge, 1669), 2:466–468.

38 The first four were the minor orders in the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical hierarchy, while subdeacons were the lowest of the major orders. All five were abolished in 1972.

39 I.e., other clerical positions in the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

COROLLARIA.

I *An ministri futuri ordinatio in Ecclesia semper requiratur?*

Sicuti ejus vocationem, sic ejusdem ordinationem in Ecclesia jam constituta semper requiri, adversus Socinianos *affirmamus, tum quia Apostoli et Evangelistae ritum illum ordinationis, ut ipsi quoque Sociniani confitentur, in Ecclesiam Christi introduxerunt, tum quia Ecclesiae ordo ac decorum efflagitat, ut idem ritus in domo Dei perpetuo observetur.*

II *Quomodo Christus qui clavem habet Davidis, eam Petro quoque tradiderit.*

Nos Christum Davidis clavem habere, ut Ecclesiae Dominum atque Episcoporum principem oecumenicum, Petrum vero eam a Christo, ut fidum mysteriorum Regni ipsius dispensatorem atque administrum, accepisse, respondemus.

III *An Christus claves Regni coelorum soli Petro, an vero easdem Petri quoque coapostolis tradiderit?*

Nos Christum easdem claves omnibus suis Apostolis eodem modo ac fine tradidisse ex aequipollentibus Christi effatis, Matt.* 16, 19. *et Johan.* 20, 23. *adversus Pontificios concludimus.*

IV *An Apostolus Paulus cum hominem incestuosum Satanae traderet, quicquam peculiare habuerit?*

Nos contra Socinianos, Apostolum Paulum non ex jure sibi peculiari, sed sibi cum omnibus Ecclesiae presbyteris communi, incestuosum illum Satanae tradidisse, colligimus ex 1 Cor.* 5, 5. *et Matt.* 18, 17. 18.

Corollary

Whether it is always necessary to ordain a future minister in the Church? 1

Over against the Socinians we affirm that the ordination of the minister, like his calling, is always required in a church that has already been instituted.[40] This is so because the apostles and evangelists introduced that practice of ordination in Christ's Church (as the Socinians themselves also admit), and because the Church's good order and decency demands that the same practice always be observed in God's house.

How did Christ, who has the key of David, also hand it down to Peter? 2

Our reply is that Christ holds the key of David as Lord of the Church and universal Chief of the overseers; but Peter received it from Christ as a faithful steward and minister of the mysteries of his kingdom.

Whether Christ handed the keys of the kingdom of heaven only to Peter or in fact to Peter and his co-apostles? 3

Over against the papal teachers we conclude from the declarations by Christ that were of equal force to both parties (Matthew 16:19; John 20:23) that Christ handed those keys to all of his apostles in the same manner and for the same goal.*

Whether the apostle Paul possessed some special right when he handed the man who had committed incest over to Satan? 4

Over against the Socinians we gather from 1 Corinthians 5:5 and Matthew 18:17–18 that the apostle Paul did not hand to Satan that man who had committed incest by virtue of some special right, but by the one that he shared* with all the elders of the Church.

40 See theses 39–44 above.

Glossary of Concepts and Terms

Absolute (adv.): independently, existing without being dependent on something else (gr.); referring to values or principles that may be viewed without relation to other things. It is opposed to *relative* (adv.) which means that something is related to or dependent on something else, and is not relativistic in the modern sense of the word. Cf. *absolutus* (adj.): without qualification, restriction; free, and *relativus* (adj.): having a relation.

Accidens (n.): a property of a thing that is not essential to the thing itself; or, property of a material substance not contained or entailed by its definition (Aristotle). Regarding God, it is commonly denied that God has 'accidents', since God is spiritual, and not a material entity.

Actus (n.): act; actuality. That which exists or is actualized, in distinction from that which has the potential to exist in the future (cf. *potentia*). Compared to the Aristotelian duality of 'act' and 'potency', Christian thought abandons the notion of necessary realization of potencies. *Actus* is also used as distinct from *facultas* as the specific act that is distinct from the general capacity. Sometimes the underlying general capacity is called 'first act' (*actus primus*), whereas the concrete, realized act is called 'second act' (*actus secundus*). Thus, in case of a volition, the capacity of willing opposite acts on the level of the 'first act' is abstracted from the concrete act of will on the level of the 'second act'. Or it might be said that underlying the concrete act of faith on the level of the 'second act', there is the capacity to this act in terms of the 'seed of regeneration' on the level of the 'first act'; cf. *STP* 31.38.

Ad intra/*extra:* toward the inside/outside; inward/outward. For classic Reformed theology, the Augustinian distinction between the internal and external works of God (*opera ad intra*/*ad extra*) is decisive. The *opera ad intra* are the internal Trinitarian relations; the *opera ad extra* are the eternal, contingent acts of the divine knowledge and will. What is *ad intra* is essential and necessary, what is *ad extra* is eternal and contingent.

Administratio (n.): see *dispensatio*.

Aequivocus (adj.): ambiguous, having like but not identical significations; equivocal. Diction can be univocal, equivocal, or analogous. Different uses of the same word can have different meanings, causing semantic ambiguity. See also *analogia*.

Affectus (n.): a state, mood or desire. In Aristotelian psychology it is one of the faculties of the soul and is related to *intellectus* and *voluntas* in various ways.

Affirmatio (n.): an affirmed, asserted, and confirmed proposition. Also called *propositio positiva* as opposed to a negated proposition (*propositio negativa*). See also *negatio* and *privatio*.

Analogia (n.): a relation of likeness; analogy. It is primarily a concept which refers to the theory of predication. The same term can be attributed to different subjects in ways that are univocal (having the same meaning), equivocal (having a different meaning), and analogous (having a similar meaning).

Arbitrium (n.): see *voluntas*.

Attributum (n.): specific property, attribute; proper, essential quality. In theological Latin *attributum* indicates what is essential *for God*. It is a property that is entailed by God's individual essence.

Causa (n.): cause; that which effects motion or change (Gk. *aition*). In the Aristotelian system there are four kinds of cause: material, formal, efficient, final. This theory of causality excludes the Christian notion of creation and contingency, since the 'Aristotelian' causes operate in a necessary way. In medieval Latin, *causa* was not necessarily a heavily-laden concept; its basic meaning is *condition*: that which is required for the existence of something. For the Protestant scholastics the productive or effective cause (*causa efficiens*) becomes the foremost concept; it is further divided into the principal and the instrumental cause. The pattern of fourfold causality continues to be employed as a structure to cover the most important aspects of a given entity. For example: A carpenter is the efficient cause of a bed and his saw is an instrumental cause. Wood and metal are the material cause, and a specific structure of wood and metal is the formal cause of the bed. Sleeping is the final cause, or goal, of the bed. The efficient and final causes are extrinsic, while matter and form are intrinsic causes. See also *finis*. The impelling or impulsive cause (*causa impulsiva interna*; Gk. *proēgoumenē*) offers occasion to the efficient cause and indicates the internal occasion or incentive for action. The initiating cause (*causa impulsiva externa*; Gr. *prokatarktikē*) refers to an external occasion.

Communis (adj.): common; shared; general. It refers to something shared by two or more parties, or what has been communicated. It is the opposite of *singularis*, what is individual or singular.

Communicabilis (adj.): that which can be common or can be shared; communicable. A property that is *communicable* may be held by more than one other entity or person. An *incommunicable* property cannot be shared between entities or persons.

Contingentia (n.): see *necessitas*.

Definitus (adj.): limited; definite, determinate. In the doctrine of God the term is connected with what God wills; *definitum* is what rests on God's free decision. Applied to the attribute of God's knowledge, it means that God's indefinite knowledge (*scientia indefinita*) comprises what God *can* know, whereas his definite knowledge (*scientia definita*) regards the factual world, that is the whole of factual reality, the created universe.

Demonstrare (v.): to show, demonstrate; to deliver a proof. It is the strictest form of an argument and of a proof: both the premises of the argument and the deductive relation between the propositions have to be necessary and self-evident. See also *probare* and *monstrare*.

Determinare (v.): to define, determine, prescribe; to decide. The term may be used specifically to indicate the eternal and contingent act of will whereby God selects the possibilities to be actualized in the actual history of the world. His definite knowledge (*scientia definita*) is his determinate knowledge of the actual. If a proposition is *determinata*, it has a truth value. See also *definitus*.

Dispensatio (n.): administration, arrangement; dispensation; economy (Gk. *oikonomia*). As a theological term dispensation may indicate the economy of salvation (*oeconomia salutis*) and its divisions, or the various stages of God's covenant with humankind. In the theology of the Trinity, the classic tradition distinguishes between the *essential* and the *economical* Trinity.

Emanans (part.): see *immanens*.

Essentia (n.): essence, being, existence; intrinsic, indispensable quality of a thing (Gk. *ousia*). The term has a wide range of usages. In the Aristotelian tradition *essentia* has the same meaning as *substantia secunda*, indicating the essence or form of a material thing.

Essentialis (adj.): essential; the quality that makes a being, and apart from which a being cannot be conceived (Gk. *ousiodōs*). In the theology of the

Trinity what is essential is contrasted with what is personal (*personalis*, or *hupostatikōs*). *Essentialis* pertains to what proceeds characteristically from the nature or the essence of God.

Evidentia (n.): evidence. In scholastic discourse it points to the certainty of a proposition.

Facultas (n.): ability, capacity; authority; branch of studies; faculty. It can also mean (financial) resources. It is the talent by which one is able to do something, and as such is distinct from the concrete act.

Figuratus, figurativus (adj.): In the traditional view, theological language is mainly used literally, not figuratively. In the proposition 'God is good', 'good' is used literally. In the proposition 'God is my rock', 'rock' is used figuratively, for God *is* not a rock.

Finis (n.) aim, goal; end. *Finis* answers the question "to what end?" It plays a main role in the Reformed doctrine of God because of the decisive significance of the aim or goal God pursues—knowingly and willingly—in his works and actions. This approach differs from Aristotle's philosophy of causality which is a philosophy of necessary and impersonal change. See also *causa*.

Fundamentum (n.): foundation, basis. This term plays a crucial part in the theory of relation. In the relation *aRb*, for example 'God creates the world', *a*, or God is called the foundation (*fundamentum*) of the relation *R*. In an epistemological context the word indicates the theoretical basis of an argument.

Generatio (n.): fertility; production, birth; kind; generation. It is the opposite of corruption. In the Trinitarian language of the church fathers, the Father *begets* (generates) the Son while He himself is *unbegotten*. *Generatio* became a key term in the theology of the Trinity: there are two processions in God, the Son proceeds from the Father, while the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. From the viewpoint of the Father the first procession is called *generatio*, from the perspective of the Son it is called sonship (*filiatio*). See also *processio*.

Genus (n.): class. It is a taxonomic category ranking above *species* (kind) and below family, wherein individual items are identified as a group by shared universals (e.g., "animal" is the *genus* common to man and beast; "man" and "beast" are the *species* distinguished by "mind-gifted" as the *differentia specifica*). In

Aristotle's philosophy the distinction belongs to the theory of the forms which constitute reality; in Christian thought, however, the forms have no creative power. See also *species* and *substantia*.

Gratia (n.): grace. It is used of God's benevolence towards sinful humanity, and the divine working of regeneration. Faith and trust in God are created and given by God. A person is justified, if by God's grace and favor faith and love are working in his heart and life. The Reformed tradition differs from the Lutheran view (*simul justus*, *simul peccator*), by stating that a Christian is justified and thus righteous (*justus*) and not a sinner (*peccator*). This, of course, does not mean that he no longer commits sins.

Habitus (n.): a condition or a disposition. In scholastic discourse it is halfway between *potentia* and *actus*. It has more to do with acting or doing than with being. It has to do with acquired virtuous dispositions in knowledge or in morals. It can be defined as someone's attitude or mood, or as a tendency to act or to think in a certain way.

Hupostasis (n. Gk.): see *persona*.

Hupostatikōs (adv. Gk.): see *personalis*.

Immanens (adj.): existing or operating within; inherent. It is opposed to *transiens*: what is directed at an external object. This distinction parallels that of *opera ad intra* and *ad extra*. What is called *immanens*, is also called *ad intra*, *inter se*.

Immediate (adv.): see *mediate*.

Immutabilitas (n.): immutability, changelessness. Originally, usage of the term assumed that immutability is equivalent with necessity. In this respect it functions in the doctrine of incommunicable properties of God. A second meaning of immutability is 'unchanging': if God's eternal knowledge of reality is called immutable, this does not imply that this knowledge is necessary, but that it does not change over time. God's eternal knowledge does not change diachronically, but it is contingent synchronically.

Improprie (adv.): see *proprie*.

Incommunicabilis (adj.): see *communicabilis*.

Infinitas (n.): boundlessness; infinity; endlessness. Being finite is having an end, being limited; being infinite is having no end, being un-ending, unlimited, limitless. When applied to number, infinity indicates an immense number. In the doctrine of God the term acquires a specific meaning: if God is infinite, He is infinite not potentially but actually—which was an impossible notion in Greek philosophy. The concept of actual infinity runs parallel to the notion of God's perfection (*perfectus*, complete). God's infinite knowledge is complete knowledge. See also *perfectio*.

In se: in itself. The distinction *in se* / *secundum quid* (according to something) parallels the distinction between *absolute* (q.v.) and *relative*. The *secundum quid* identifies a specific point to which a predicate applies, and not something as it is in itself.

Lex naturae (n.): law of nature; natural law. In Greek philosophy this is a cosmological concept, the justice embodied in the cosmos (not an ethical concept). In Christian thought, the law of nature becomes a personal and ethical notion. It is usually considered to be a self-evident rule.

Mediate (adv.): involving an intermediate agent; connected indirectly. What is immediate, does not require any deliberation or mediation. What is mediate requires mediation so that at least one or several steps are needed to arrive at the aim.

Modus (n.): way, manner; mode, form. *Modus* is both a general word (way, manner) and a technical term (mode, form). Scholasticism distinguishes between many kinds of *modi*. The basic *modi*-distinction relates to the levels of existence and language: *modi essendi* and *modi significandi*. A property can be predicated of a thing, and a property or quality can be an essential or an accidental property.

Monstrare (v.): to indicate; to show. Not, in the first instance, a technical term. Delivering proofs is *monstrare*. Cf. *demonstrare* and *probare*.

Natura (n.): nature, natural reality; essence. In Christian thought, nature is created nature; in the Middle Ages a distinction was made between what is so in a *natural* way ('non-rational') and what is *willed* ('rational'). In theology, *natura* may be used as a synonym of *essentia* (q.v.). God's nature is dealt with in terms of essential properties which are communicable or incommunicable. In Christology it is used for the divine and human natures of Christ, the God-and-man (*theanthrōpos*). See also *attributum* and *communicabilis*.

Naturalis (adj.): of or belonging to the nature of things; natural. It is opposed to what is super-natural. In medieval theological Latin, *supernaturalis* indicated that God is above natural reality: He is the creator. In the second half of the fifteenth century the idea of the *duplex ordo* of reality was developed: nature and super-nature. In creation reality has received its own order which suffices, in principle, to arrive at its own perfection. This means that a human person can, in principle, arrive at her own happiness and goodness. Grace and sin are then additional, 'supernatural' aspects which enrich or impoverish life, but they are not crucial and decisive in having impact for what a human person really is.

Necessitas (n.): necessity. It is the opposite of contingency (*contingentia*). In ancient philosophy the notions of necessity and immutability coincide. What is necessary, is always the case; the contingent is sometimes the case and sometimes not. In Christian thought something is considered to be necessary if is it not possible that it is not the case. Similarly, 'contingent' is not conceived in terms of different moments of time but as synchronically alternative.

Nomen (n.): name; noun. The basic functions of a noun are to have a meaning or signification so that something can be said or predicated of something. The disputations in the *Synopsis* usually start with explaining the meanings of the terms involved terms, so that a *nomen* usually is: a meaning-bearing noun.

Notio communis (n., adj.): an insight shared by a number of people.

Notitia approbativa (n.): see *notitia theoretica*.

Notitia practica (n.): see *notitia theoretica*.

Notitia simplex (n.): see *notitia theoretica*.

Notitia theoretica (n.): Theoretical knowledge, as distinct from practical knowledge. God's theoretical knowledge (*notitia theoretica*) contains what God necessarily knows, including all possibilities. This form of knowledge does not rest on an act of God's will, and it does not entail the actual existence of the objects of knowledge. God's *theoretical* knowledge is his absolute knowledge. God's practical knowledge (*notitia practica*) comprises all that He knows contingently, including the whole of created reality. This knowledge rests on an act of God's will. In the second half of the seventeenth century the distinction between God's theoretical and practical knowledge was superseded by

the parallel distinction between God's natural knowledge (*scientia naturalis*) and God's free knowledge (*scientia libera*), which became the standard term for God's practical knowledge. These distinctions run parallel to each other. See also *potentia absoluta/ordinata*. God's knowledge can also be distinguished as the knowledge by which He approves of and affirms what He knows (*notitia approbativa*), on the basis of his own wisdom and goodness, and the knowledge of mere understanding (*notitia simplex*).

Oeconomia (n. Gk.): see *dispensatio*.

Ousia (n. Gk.): essence; substance. Greek terms in the *Synopsis* do not play an independent role. The authors translated Greek terms back into Latin theological terms. See *essentia*.

Ousiodoos (adv. Gk.): see *essentialis*.

Partes essentiales (n.): essential parts; main constituents. According to the Scholastics, a material entity consists of matter of which it is made, but it has also a *form* in virtue of which it is *what* it is. Thus, matter and form are the essential parts or the main constituents of reality and real things.

Partes integrales (n.): integral parts; quantitative constituents. Distinct from *essential parts*, the integral parts indicate the material components of an entity. For example, 'arms' and 'legs' are the integral parts of a body.

Perfectio (n.): perfection, completeness. A term derived from the Latin verb *perficere* which means: to make up, to finish; to complete. *Perfectio* refers to the complete condition of a thing or an attribute. In the *Synopsis* it is used mostly as a divine attribute or as the property of the results of divine actions (e.g., Scripture or the final perfect state of the blessed).

Persona (n.): mind-gifted individual; person. In theological discourse, the term first appeared in discussions of the doctrine of the Trinity, as a translation of the Greek word *hupostasis* that distinguishes the three divine 'persons' from the divine nature. In its broader application, it means a rational person or *suppositum*, in contrast with animals, trees, stones, things, which are not *rational*. This use of 'rational' does not follow the modern usage; it means: gifted with the faculty of thinking and arguing, and of willing and choosing.

Personalis (adj.): belonging characteristically to a person. Applied specifically to the persons of the Trinity, *personalis* ('personal') refers to the incommunicable personal attributes of each member.

Posse (v.): to be able; can. In scholastic Latin a logical and ontological concept of *posse* was developed which was based on the principle of non-contradiction. When it is said that a proposition is possible (*possibilis*), this means that it is free from contradiction: it is consistent. In Aristotelian philosophy the possible refers to what has potency: now it is not the case, but it will be. See also *potentia*.

Potentia (n.): power; potency. It refers to that which can exist or has the potential to exist (cf. *actus*). The term *potentia* can also be used as a synonym of *facultas*. See also *posse* and *necessitas*.

Potentia absoluta (n.): absolute power. By the term 'absolute power' (as distinct from 'ordained power') the Scholastics pointed out that it does not depend on God's will, for it is not determined by God's actual will. What is possible consists of what is consistent in terms of what God *can* will. The whole of these possibilities is not defined by God's will. 'Ordained power' (*potentia ordinata*) is constituted by, and rests on, an act of God's will. While *potentia absoluta* focuses on what God *can* do, the *potentia actualis* or *ordinata* pertains to what God in fact *does*. The distinction of *potentia absoluta* and *potentia actualis* runs parallel to the distinction of the *notitia Dei theoretica* and *practica*.

Potentia actualis (n.): see *potentia absoluta*.

Praedicare (v.): to preach; to predicate. It is used to affirm or attribute a property or an act to a subject.

Praescientia (n.): see *notitia*.

Principium (n.): beginning, source, origin; fundamental principle. In scholastic argumentation, a primary, self-evident proposition on which further reasoning is based.

Privatio (n.): deprivation; the removal of a positive attribute.

Probare (v.): to prove. *Proof* (*probatio*) is a rather broad notion that covers several kinds of proofs. *Demonstratio*, by contrast, is a strict kind of proof

in which necessarily true conclusions are necessarily derived from evident premises. Thus, the notion of *probatio* is similar to the modern concept of *proof*. See also *demonstrare*.

Processio (n.): procession. The term refers to the property or act by which the Holy Spirit proceeds from God the Father and God the Son as from a single principle. In a wider sense, it is also used for the *generatio* by which God the Son eternally proceeds from God the Father. Although the process may also be called a production, it is essentially different from any causal production, because the *processiones* are essential to God. Like the *generatio* of the Son, the *processio* or *spiratio* of the Holy Spirit is conceived as an essential, necessary relation on the level of the immanent Trinity.

Proprie (adv.): properly; strictly. A word is used *proprie*, if it is used according to its literal and original meaning. So, when the use of a word develops into new meanings, the word is used *improprie*.

Proximus (n., adj.): neighbor; neighboring; very near; proximate. *Proximius* means 'more closely' and *de proximo* 'soon'. A *causa proxima* (or *principium proximum*) is the direct, nearby cause of something, as distinct from the more remote factors (*causae remotae*) that are involved. See also *causa*.

Qualitas (n.): Quality. One of the crucial Aristotelian categories, *qualitas* is an accident that affects the substance. The traditional list of Aristotle's category is: quantity, quality, relation, place, time, position, state, action and passivity.

Ratio (n.): computation, account; reason, (logical) account; amount, proportion; ground, underlying principle, aspect; argument, method. In contrast to the modern use of 'rational' a *ratio* regards the objective side of something: for this reason, ground.

Relatio (n.): relation. In a general sense, beings can be related in an intrinsic or extrinsic way (a mother is intrinsically related to her child; the passengers are extrinsically related to the train). In scholastic language, *relatio* has a conceptual rather than a real status. The development of the theory of relation served in particular to explain the nature of the relationships among the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in the Trinity.

Relative (adv.): see *absolute*.

Religio (n.): religion. Unlike the modern usage of 'religion', in medieval Latin *religio* indicates the religious or monastic life. Later it meant the dedicated and committed Christian life, arising from the knowledge, love and reverence of God. Compared to *religio*, *cultus* means 'worship', 'service'.

Remotus (part.): see *proximus*.

Res (n.): thing; an actual, real thing. Whatever exists, exists as a really distinct entity. In classical Latin *res* was also used to translate the Greek *to on*, for classical Latin has no present participle of *esse*. *Ens* is an invention of medieval Latin. *Res* indicates what exists according to its essential aspects.

Sacramentum (n.): a holy rite; mystery; sacrament. A *sacramentum* is a *thing* (*res*) which is used to convey hidden meaning or significance. In classical Latin *sacramentum* can also refer to a military oath. In Christian contexts it was used both of rites, prayers and objects in general, and of the sacraments in particular. Next to the sacraments proper, the *sacramentalia* denote sacred actions in a wider sense. In theology *sacramentum* became a technical term in the twelfth century, and referred to one of the seven (Catholic) sacraments. The *Synopsis* defends two sacraments: actions which receive their special significance in virtue of divine words.

Scholasticus (n.): schoolman. When used in a general sense, *scholastici* refers to contemporary scholastic theologians or scholastic thinkers. It is not a technical term referring to medieval Scholastics.

Scientia (n.): Knowledge or a specific branch of knowledge which according to Aristotelian philosophy can be traced back to self-convincing first principles; also see *notitia*.

Secundum quid: see *in se*.

Sermo (n.): see *vox*.

Significare (v.): to signify; to have meaning. Most scholastic philosophy of language distinguishes between two fundamental uses of nouns: predicating and referring. Predication is executed in virtue of the meaning of the involved word. See also *praedicare*.

Simplicitas (n.): the quality of being uncomplicated, uncompounded, or unmixed; simplicity. A simple act is one that does not consist of components. In

Aristotelian philosophy, reality is not simple: it is composed of form and matter, act and potency. In Christian philosophy, God is simple, not consisting of form and matter. The ascription of 'simplicity' to God does not extinguish the 'formal' or 'conceptual' distinctions between the attributes of God. See *attributum*.

Species: see *genus*.

Spiratio (n.): breathing, breath; spiration. *Spiratio* becomes a key term in the theology of the Trinity, and expresses the act by which Holy Spirit (*Spiritus sanctus*) proceeds from the Father and the Son. From the viewpoint of the Father and the Son the procession of the Holy Spirit is called *spiratio*.

Subjectum (n.): foundation of a proposition; subject; topic of a predication. *Subjectum* can be the substrate which functions as the bearer of a specifying form, but usually *subjectum* has to be understood on the logical level as the subject of a proposition.

Subsistentia (n.): subsistence. The property by which an entity is capable of existing *per se*, in itself, or in its own right. It focuses on the aspect of the independence of the existence of what there is. It is mainly said of substances, *supposita* and persons. See *essentia* and *persona*.

Substantia (n.): that which exists; substance. In theological contexts, *substantia* was originally used to render the Greek term *ousia*. The distinction between first and second substances (*substantia prima*, *secunda*) derives from Aristotle's metaphysics: a first substance is a material, individual entity we experience in reality, and the second substance is the essence of that first substance that makes it to be *what* it is. On the level of the second substance the distinction between *genus* and *species* operates.

Supernaturalis: see *naturalis*.

Suppositum a self-existent, self-subsistent thing. Literally, substrate or subsisting reality. In the history of logic *supponere* ('to place as subject') came to mean 'to refer'; thus *suppositum* also means: referent.

Synecdoche (n.): a figure of speech whereby a more comprehensive term is employed to refer to a less comprehensive one, as a whole for part, or vice versa.

Terminus (n.): end; term; fixed period of time. In the philosophical theory of relation, the *terminus* is that which the relation is related to.

Testimonium (n.): witness, testimony; text, passage; proof; last testament. The verb *testare* means 'to bear witness to'. Generally not a technical term, apart from the context of a law suit.

Verbum (n.): word, more specifically: a verb. *Verbum* is also the divine Word, or the second Person of the Trinity. See *nomen* and *vox*.

Voluntas (n.): will. *Voluntas* is the substantive form of the verb *velle* ('to wish, to want'). In the Middle Ages, the term obtains the specifically Christian meaning of 'to will decidedly', in terms of alternatives. For the latter meaning, *arbitrium* is also used. *Arbitrari* is what a referee (*arbiter*) does: to decide on the basis of what one knows. For Erasmus and Melanchthon, *arbitrium* and *voluntas* are interchangeable. Later *arbitrium* refers to choice. Both concepts, 'will' and 'choice', presuppose the contingent nature of reality.

Voluntas necessaria (n.): the necessary or natural will. God knows himself, wills and loves himself by a certain necessity, by his will (not antecedently, but concomitantly). It is impossible that God does *not* will himself, since He is the Supreme Good, and therefore the proper object of his own perfect will. The necessary will is contrasted with the free will (*voluntas libera*). Similarly, the Father cannot will contingently that He generates or loves the Son, for then it is possible that He does not generate or does not love the Son. The necessary will is related to the *opera ad intra*, and the free and contingent will to the *opera ad extra*.

Vox (n.): word. In early modern Latin, *vox* and *sermo* are often synonyms. Originally *vox* indicated a word insofar as it is a physical item expressed (voiced) by the voice—it is a word as a spoken word; *vox* also means *voice*. *Sermo* is a *vox* laden with semantic meaning; speech.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

a *Printed Sources Quoted in the Synopsis*

Albertus Magnus. *Liber de sacrificio missae*. In *Opera omnia*, vol. 38, 1–189. 38 volumes. Edited by A. Borgnet. Paris: Vives, 1890–1900.

Ambrose. *De fide orthodoxa contra Arianos*. MPL 17.

———. *De incarnationis dominicae sacramento*. CSEL 79.

———. *De Ioseph*. CSEL 32/2.

———. *Opera omnia*. Edited by Desiderius Erasmus, 4 volumes. Basel: Froben, 1527 (VD16 A 2180).

Ambrosiaster. *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti*. CSEL 50.

Augustine. *Contra Julianum*. MPL 44.

———. *De civitate Dei*. CCSL 47, 48.

———. *De correptione et gratia*. CSEL 92.

———. *De diversis quaestionibus octoginta tribus*. CCSL 44A.

———. *De dono perseverantiae*. MPL 45.

———. *De fide et operibus*. CSEL 41.

———. *De fide et symbolo*. CSEL 41.

———. *De gestis Pelagii*. CSEL 42.

———. *De gratia et libero arbitrio liber unus*. MPL 44.

———. *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali*. CSEL 42.

———. *De haeresibus*. CCSL 46.

———. *De peccatorum meritis et remissione*. CSEL 60.

———. *De trinitate*. CCSL 50.

———. *Enchiridion ad Laurentium*. CCSL 46.

———. *Ennarrationes in Psalmos*. CCSL 38, 39, 40.

———. *Epistulae*. CSEL 34, 44, 57.

———. *In Ioannis evangelium tractatus*. CCSL 36.

———. *Quaestionum evangeliorum*. MPL 35.

———. *Sermones*. MPL 38, 39.

Augustine of Ancona. *Summa de potestate ecclesiastica*. Rome: Ferrarius, 1584 (USTC 861232).

Barradius, Sebastianus. *Commentaria in concordiam et historiam evangelicam*, 4 volumes. [Cologne]: Mylius, 1601–1627 (VD17 12:120359H).

Bellarmine, Robert. *Disputationes de controversiis christianae fidei adversus hujus temporishaereticos*. Ingolstadt: David Sartorius, 1587–1593 (VD16 B 1606). Repr. in *Opera omnia*, vol. 1–7. 12 volumes. Paris: Vives, 1870–1874.

———. *De gemitu columbae, sive de bono lacrymarum, libri tres*. Cologne: Gualtherus, 1617 (VD17 12:100723H). Repr. in: *Opera omnia*, vol. 8.

Bernard of Clairvaux. *De gratia et libero arbitrio*. In *Sämtliche Werke*, vol. 1. Edited by Gerhard B. Winkler. 10 vols. Innsbruck: Tyrolia, 1990–1999. [English edition: *On Grace and Free Choice*. Translated by Daniel O'Donovan. Kalamazoo: Cistercian, 1988.]

———. *Epistola*. *Sämtliche Werke*, vol. 3.

———. *Sermones in Cantica canticorum*. *Sämtliche Werke*, vol. 5, 6.

Beza, Theodore. *Ad acta colloquii Montisbelgardensis Tubingae edita, Theodori Bezae responsionis pars altera, Editio tertia, in qua praeterea est index adjectus*. Geneva: Ioannes le Preux, 1589 (USTC 451188).

Cajetan, Thomas de Vio. *Commentaria in Summa St. Thomae et quodlibetales questiones*. Antwerp: Thomas Lyndam, 1574.

Calvin, John. *Calumniae nebulonis cuiusdam quibus odio et invidia gravare conatus est doctrinam Ioh. Calvini de occulta Dei providentia Johannis Calvini ad easdem responsio*. CR 37 (CO 9).

Calvin, John. *De aeterna praedestinatione*. CR 36 (CO 8).

Cassian. *De incarnatione Domini contra Nestorium*. CSEL 17.

Cassiodorus. *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita*. CSEL 71.

Castro, Alfonso de. *Adversus omnes haereses*. Paris: Vascosanus, 1541 (USTC 140106).

Catechismus Romanus seu Catechismus ex decreto Concilii Tridentini ad parochos Pii V pont. max. iussu editus. Edited by Pedro Rodríguez and Ildefonso Adeva. Vatican City: Officina Libraria Vaticana, 1989.

Chrysostom. *Commentarius in sanctum Matthaeum evangelistam,* MPG 57.

Cicero. *Somnium Scipionis*, LCL 213.

Claudius Claudianus. *In Rufinum*. In *Claudii Claudiani carmina*. Edited by John Barrie Hall. Leipzig: Teubner, 1985.

Cyprian. *Ad Demetrianum* 25. CSEL 3A.

———. *De bono patientiae*

———. *Epistulae*. CCSL 3A–B.

Cyril of Jerusalem. *Catechesis*. MPG 33.

Domingo de Soto. *In quartum sententiarum commentarii*, 2 volumes. Medina del Campo: Franciscus à Canto, 1581 (USTC 341875 and 341876).

Durandus of St. Pourçain. *In Sententias theologicas Petri Lombardi commentariorum*. Lyon, Guillaume Rouillé, 1563 (USTC 142451).

Ephraem the Syrian. *Opera omnia quae extant Graece, Syriace, Latine*, 6 volumes. Rome: Salvioni, 1732–1746.

———. *Operum omnium Sancti Ephraem Syri*. Edited by Gerardus Vossius Borghlonius, 3 volumes. Rome: Tornerius, 1589–1593.

Epiphanius. *Panarion* or *Adversus haereses*. GCS 25.

———. *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*. Edited by Frank Williams. Leiden: Brill 1994.

Eusebius. *Historia ecclesiastica*. SC 41.

Fisher, John. *Assertionis Lutheranae confutatio*. Cologne: Peter Quentel, 1523 (VD16 F 1215).

Francisco de Toledo. *De instructione sacerdotum et peccatis mortalibus*. Douai: Bellerus, 1608.

Fulgentius. *Ad Monimum*. CCSL 91.

Gellius. *Noctes Atticae*. LCL 212.

Gesta conlationis Carthaginiensis. CCSL 149A.

Gratian. *Decretum Gratiani emendatum et notationibus illustratum una cum glossis*. Lyons: Antoine Pillehotte, 1624.

———. *Decretum*. In *Decretum magistri Gratiani*, vol. 1. Edited by Emil Friedberg, 2 volumes. Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1879–1881.

Gregory of Valencia. *Commentarii theologici in quibus omnes materiae, quae continentur in Summa theologica divi Thomae Aquinatis ordine explicantur*, 2nd edition. 4 volumes. Ingolstadt: Sartorius, 1591–1597 (VD16 V 67, 69, 70, 71).

———. *Disputatio de indulgentiis*. Ingolstadt: Sartorius, 1587 (VD16 V 79).

Gregory the Great. *Epistulae*. CCSL 140A.

Huber, Samuel. *Theses, Christum Jesum esse mortuum pro peccatis omnium hominum*. Tübingen: Georg Gruppenbach, 1590 (VD16 ZV 6546).

———. *Confutatio brevis, Libri sub alieno nomine editi, de controversia inter theologos Wittebergenses et Samuelem Huberum de electione*. Mühlhausen: n.p., 1595 (VD16 H 5309).

Irenaeus. *Adversus haereses*. FC 8/1–3, 5.

Jansen, Cornelius. *Commentariorum in suam concordiam, ac totam historiam evangelicam epitome*. Antwerp: Beller, 1593.

Jerome. *Commentariorum in epistolam ad Galatas*. MPL 26.

———. *Commentariorum in epistulam ad Titum*. CCSL 77C.

———. *Commentariorum in evangelium Matthaei*. CCSL 77.

———. *Epistulae*. CSEL 56.

John of Damascus. *De fide orthodoxa*. SC 535, 540.

———. *St. John of Damascus: Writings*, The Fathers of the Church 37. Translated by Frederic H. Chase. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1958.

Juan de Maldonado. *Commentarii in quatuor evangelistas*. Edited by Franciscus Sausen, 5 volumes. Mainz: F. Kirchheim, 1840–1844.

Justinian. *Codex Justinianus*. In *Corpus juris civilis*, vol. 2. Edited by Paul Krüger, 3 volumes, 13th ed. Berlin: Weidmann, 1963.

Lactantius. *Institutiones divinae*. CSEL 19/1.

Leo the First. *Epistola Leonis Papae de privilegio chorepiscoporum sive presbiterorum*

ad universos Germanie atque Gallie ecclesiarum episcopos. In *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae et Capitula Angilramni*. Edited by Paul Hinschius. Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1863, 628–629.

Lombard, Peter. *Sententiae in iv libris distinctae*. Edited by Ignatius Brady, 3rd edition, 2 volumes. Rome: Collegium S. Bonaventurae, 1971, 1981.

Manuel de Sá. *Notationes in totam scripturam sacram*. Lyon: Cordon, 1609.

Maximus of Turin. *Sermones*. CCSL 23.

Nicephorus Callistus. *Ecclesiasticae historia*. MPL 146.

Nicolai de Cusa. *De concordantia catholica*. In *Opera omnia*, volume 14. Edited by Gerhard Kallen. Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 1964.

Origen. *Contra Celsum*. SC 150.

———. *In Leviticum homiliae*. SC 286.

———. *In Numeros homiliae*. SC 442.

Ostorodt, Christoph. *Unterrichtung von den vornemsten Hauptpuncten der Christlichen Religion*. Rakow: Sebastian Sternacki, 1604 (VD17 3:670980U).

Panigarola, Francesco. *Disceptationes Calvinicae*. Milan: Pacifico Da Ponte, 1594.

Petrus de Soto. *Tractatus de institutione sacerdotum*. Dillingen: Sebald Mayer, 1560 (VD16 S 7092).

Phaedrus, *Fabulae Aesopiae*. Edited by Lucian Müller, Leipzig: Teubner, 1876.

Platina, Bartholomaeus. *Historia de vitis pontificum romanorum*. Cologne: Maternus Cholinus, 1574 (VD16 P 3266).

Plato. *Gorgias*. LCL 166.

———. *Phaedo*. LCL 36.

Prosper of Aquitaine. *Epistula ad Rufinum*. MPL 51.

———. *Pro Augustino responsiones ad excerpta Genuensium*. MPL 51.

Pseudo-Augustine. *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti*. MPL 35. Now attributed to Ambrosiaster. CSEL 50.

Sixtus of Siena. *Bibliotheca sancta*. 2nd ed. Cologne: Maternus Cholinus, 1576 (VD16 S 6601).

Smalcius, Valentinus. *Defensio, brevis Anonymi cuiusdam, qui est Faustus Socinus, de Ecclesia et ministrorum missione tractatus adversus responsionem Andreae Miedziboz. A Theophilo Nicolaide ante annos quinque conscripta, nunc autem edita*. Rakow: Sebastian Sternacki, 1612.

Socrates of Constantinople. *Historia ecclesiastica*. SC 505.

Socinus, Faustus. *Tractatus de ecclesia*. Rakow: Sebastian Sternacki, 1611.

Stapleton, Thomas. *Authoritatis ecclesiasticae circa s. scripturarum approbationem*. Antwerp: J. Keerbergius, 1592.

Suárez, Francisco. *Disputationes metaphysicae*. In *Opera Omnia*, vol. 26. Edited by Charles Berton, 26 volumes. Paris: Vives, 1856–1861.

Tapper, Ruard. *Opera omnia*. 2 volumes. Cologne: Birckmann, 1582, (VD16 T 183).

Tertullian. *Adversus Marcionem*. SC 456.
———. *De anima* 58. CCSL 2.
———. *De carne Christi*. CCSL 2.
———. *De poenitentiae*. CSEL 76.
———. *De pudicitia*. SC 394.
Thomas Aquinas. *Summa theologiae*. 60 vols. Cambridge: Blackfriars / New York: McGraw Hill, 1964–1973.
Thou, Jacques Auguste de. *Historiarum sui temporis*, 5 volumes. Geneva: Petrus de la Rouière, 1620. [French edition: Jacques-Auguste de Thou, *Histoire universelle de Jacques-Auguste de Thou, depuis 1543 jusqu'en 1607*, 16 volumes. London / Paris: n.p., 1734.]
Valentino, Josephus Angles. *Flores theologicarum quæstionum, in quartum librum sententiarum*. 2 volumes. Antwerp: Petrus Bellerus, 1580–1581.
Vázquez, Gabriel. *Paraphrasis et compendiaria Explicatio ad nonnullas Pauli Epistolas*. Ingolstadt: Angermarius, 1613 (VD17 1:052606L).
Vergilius. *Aeneid*. LCL 63.
Wilhelm, Herzog von Bayern. *Fasciculus sacrarum orationum et litaniarum ad usum quotidianum christiani hominis, ex sanctis scripturis et patribus collectus*. Munich: Nicolaus Henricus, 1618 (VD17 23:291605R).

b *Medieval and Early Modern Publications*

Abelard, Peter. *Opera hactenus seorsim edita*. 2 volumes. Paris: Durand, 1849–1859.
Altenstaig, Johannes, edited by Johannes Tytz. *Lexicon theologicum quo tanquam clave theologiae fores aperiuntur, et omnium fere terminorum et obscuriorum vocum, quae s. theologiae studiosos facile remorantur, etymologiae, ambiguitates, definitiones, usus, enucleate ob oculos ponuntur, & dilucide explicantur*. Cologne: Henning, 1619 (VD17 384:717260F).
Arminius, Jacobus. *The Works of James Arminius*. Translated by James Nichols and William Nichols, 3 volumes. London: Longman, 1825–1875.
Bellarmine, Robert. *Opera omnia*. 12 volumes. Paris: Vives, 1870–1874.
Bertius, Petrus. *Hymenaeus desertor, sive De sanctorum apostasia problemata duo*. Leiden: Joannes Patius, 1601.
Bilson, Thomas. *De perpetua ecclesiae Christi gubernatione*. London: Bill, 1611.
———. *The Perpetual Government of Christ's Church*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1842.
Bullinger, Heinrich. *Schriften*. Edited by Emidio Campi and others. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972–.
Bucer, Martin. *Enarrationes perpetuae, in sacra quatuor evangelia*, Basel: Johannes Herwagen, 1536 (VD 16 B 8873).
Calvin, John. *Treatises Against the Anabaptists and Against the Libertines; Translation,*

Introduction, and Notes. Translated and edited by Benjamin Wirt Farley. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1982.

———. *Christianae religionis institutio*. *OS*, vol. 1. [English edition: *Institutes of the Christian Religion: 1536 Edition*. Translated and annotated by Ford Lewis Battles. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.]

———. *Institutio christianae religionis*. *OS*, vol. 3–5. [English edition: *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Translated and annotated by Ford Lewis Battles, edited by John T. McNeill, Revised edition. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.]

Cameron, John. *Τα Σωζομενα sive Opera partim ab auctore ipso edita, partim post eius obitum vulgata, partim nusquam hactenus publicata, vel à Gallico idiomate nunc primùm in Latinam linguam translata*. Geneva: Pierre Chouet, 1659.

Chemnitz, Martin. *Examination of the Council of Trent*, trans. Fred Kramer, vol. 1. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1971.

Coccius, Jodocus. *Thesaurus catholicus*. 2 volumes. Cologne: Arnold Quentel, 1599–1601 (VD17 3:313662S and 3:313663Z).

Concilium Tridentinum: Diariorum, actorum, epistularum, tractatuum nova collectio. Edited by St. Ehses and Gorres Gesellschaft, 13 volumes. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1901–1976.

Corpus iuris canonici. Edited by Aemilius Ludovicus Richterus and Aemilius Friedberg, 2 volumes. Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1879.

DeRidder, Richard R. ed., *The Church Orders of the Sixteenth Century Reformed Churches of the Netherlands Together with Their Social, Political, and Ecclesiastical Context*. Grand Rapids: Calvin Theological Seminary, 1987.

Dieterich, Conrad. *Institutiones catecheticae*. Gießen: Caspar Chemlinus, 1623 (VD17 12:123206L).

Gerhard, Johann. *Loci theologici cum pro adstruenda veritate*. Jena: Steinmann, 1610–1625 (VD17 12:112662H).

———. *Loci theologici*. Edited by Eduard Preuss, 9 volumes. Berlin: Schlawitz, 1863–1885.

Gregory of Rimini, *Lectura super primum et secundum Sententiarium*. Edited by Damasus Trapp and Venicio Marcolino. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1980–1981.

Gretser, Jacob (trans.), *Brevis relatio de colloquio*, Ingolstadt: Angermarius, 1613 (VD17 12:106240X).

Goclenius, Rudolph. *Lexicon philosophicum quo tanquam clave philosophiae fores aperiuntur*. Frankfurt: Musculus and Becker, 1613 (VD17 23:289117S). Repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1980.

Haak, Theodore. *The Dutch Annotations upon the whole Bible*. London: Henry Hills, 1657.

Heyden, Gasper van der (ed.). *Protocol, dat is de gansche handelinge des gesprecks, te Franckenthal*. [Dordrecht]: [Jan Canin], 1571.

Hoenderdaal, Gerrit J. (ed.). *Verklaring van Jacobus Arminius afgelegd in de vergadering van de Staten van Holland op 30 Oktober 1608*. Lochem: De Tijdstroom, 1960.

John Baptist de Mantua. *Fratris Baptiste Mantuani Carmelite theologi, oratoris et poete clarissimi prima Parthenice que Mariana inscribitur*. Nürnberg: Friedrich Peypus, 1516 (VD16 S 7331).

Juan de Maldonado. *Commentarii in quatuor evangelistas*. Lyons: Cardon 1607. [English edition: *A Commentary on the Holy Gospels*. Translated by George J. Davie, 2 volumes. London: J. Hodges, 1888.]

Kercken-ordeninghe, ghestelt in den Nationalen Synode der Ghereformeerde kercken. Arnhem: Jan Janszoon, 1620.

Marnix, heer van Sint Aldegonde, Philips van. *De bijen-korf der H. Roomsche Kerk*. Edited by Johannes Justus van Toorenenbergen. Groningen: Schierbeek, 1862.

Melchior de Flavin. *Resolutiones in quatuor libros*. Paris: Guillaume de la Nouë, 1579.

Miguel de Medina. *Christianae paraenesis siue De recta in Deum fide libri septem*. Venice: Iordani Zileti, 1564.

Monfasani, John. "Antonius de Waele." In *Cambridge Translations of Renaissance Philosophical Texts*, volume 1, Moral Philosophy, edited by Jill Kraye. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, 120–129.

Nicholas of Clémanges. *Opera omnia*. Edited by Johannes Martinus Lydius. Leiden: Johannes Baldwin, 1613.

Ostorodt, Christoph, and Andreas Wojdowski. *Apologia: ofte verantwoordinghe op't decreet der Staten der vereenichde Nederlanden*. Rakow: [Rodecki], 1600.

Polyander, Johannes. *Disputationum theologicarum trigesima, de hominum vocatione ad salutem*, resp. Henricus Geldorpius. Leiden: Isaac Elzevir, 1622.

———. *Disputationum theologicarum repetitarum trigesima, de vocatione hominum ad salutem*, resp. Valentius Gerhardi Goarishusanus. Leiden: Elzevir, 1627.

Quenstedt, Johann Andreas. *Theologia didactico-polemica sive Systema theologicum*. 4 volumes. Wittenberg: Quenstedius, 1691 (VD17 3:606956Y).

Rahtmann, Hermann. *Jesu Christi, des Königs aller Könige und Herrn aller Herren Gnadenreich*. Danzig: Andreas Hünefeldt, 1621 (VD17 39:134177R).

Ramus, Petrus. *Dialecticae libri duo*. Paris: Andreas Wechelus, 1572 (USTC 170086).

Rees, Thomas, ed. *The Racovian Catechism, with Notes and Illustrations, Translated from the Latin: To Which is Prefixed a Sketch of the History of Unitarianism in Poland and the Adjacent Countries*. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, & Brown, 1818.

Rivetus, Andreas. *Disputationum theologicarum vigesima-septima, de statu humiliationis Iesu Christi*, resp. Samuel Rivetus. Leiden: Isaac Elzevir, 1622.

———. *Disputationum theologicarum trigesima-prima, de fide et perseverantia sanctorum*, resp. Paulus Testardus. Leiden: Isaac Elzevir, 1622.

———. *Disputationum theologicarum trigesima-quinta, de libertate christiana*, resp. Jacobus Henricus. Leiden: Isaac Elzevir, 1622.

———. *Disputationum theologicarum trigesima-nona, de purgatorio et indulgentiis*, resp. Guilielmus Soestius. Leiden: Isaac Elzevir, 1623.

———. *Commentarii in librum secundum Mosis*. Leiden: Franciscus Hegerus, 1634.

———. *Critici Sacri Libri IV. In quibus expenduntur, confirmantur, defenduntur, vel reiiciuntur censurae doctorum tam ex orthodoxis quam ex pontificiis, in scripta quae patribus plerisque priscorum et posteriorum et puriorum saeculorum incogitantia vel error afinxit aut dolus malus supposuit. Praefixus est tractatus de patrum autoritate, errorum causis et nothorum notis*. 4th edition. Geneva: Jacobus Chouet, 1642.

———. *Commentarius in Psalmorum propheticorum, de mysteriis evangelicis, dodecadem selectam*. Rotterdam: Arnoldus Leers, 1645.

———. *Opera theologica*, 3 vols., Rotterdam: Arnout Leers, 1651–1660.

Rościszewski, Wojciech (= Andreas Miedziboz). *Ad brevem cuiusdam de ecclesia et ministris demonstrationem, verius autem longam deliberationem, Andreae Miedzybosz Responsio*. Krakow: [n.p.], 1607.

Rutherford, Samuel. *Disputatio scholastica de divina providentia*. Edinburgh: George Anderson, 1649.

Schoppe, Caspar. *Apologeticus adversus Aegidium Hunium pro gemino de indulgentiis libro*. Munich: Henricus, 1601 (VD17 12:112724C).

Scotus, John Duns. *Ordinatio*. In *Ioannis Duns Scoti Opera omnia*. Edited by Commissio Scotistica, vols. 1–7. Vatican City: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1950–1973.

Selnecker, Nikolaus. *Epistolarum et evangeliorum dispositio, quae in diebus festis b. Mariae semper virginis et s. apostolorum in ecclesia proponuntur*. Frankfurt: Moenus, 1575 (VD16 E 4427).

Socinus, Faustus. *De Iesu Christo Servatore, Hoc est, cur et qua ratione Iesus Christus noster seruator sit* Krakow: Alexander Rodecius, 1594.

Soto, Domingo de. *De natura et gratia*. Paris: Foucher, 1549.

Suárez, Francisco. *Opus de triplici virtute theologica*. Paris: Edmundus Martin, 1621.

———. *Opera omnia*, vol. 26. Edited by Charles Berton, 26 volumes. Paris: Vives, 1856–1861.

Thysius, Antonius. *Disputationum theologicarum vigesima-quinta, de Filii dei incarnatione et unione personali duarum naturarum in Christo*, resp. Nicolaus Balbianus. Leiden: Isaac Elzevir, 1622.

———. *Disputationum theologicarum trigesime-tertia, de iustificatione hominis peccatoris coram deo*, resp. Jacobus Dissius. Leiden: Isaac Elzevir, 1622.

———. *Disputationum theologicarum repetitarum trigesima-tertia, de iustificatione hominis coram Deo*, resp. Isaacus Basirius. Leiden: Elzevir, 1627.

———. *Disputationum theologicarum repetitarum trigesima-septima, de Eleemosysis & Iejuniis*, resp. Caspar P. Thornai. Leiden: Elzevir, 1627.

Trelcatius Sr., Lucas. *Disputationum theologicarum repetitarum quadragesima-prima,*

de vocatione hominum ad salutem, resp. Hadrianus Wittius. Leiden: Joannes Patius, 1599.

Tremellius, Immanuel and Theodore Beza, *Hē Kainē Diathēkē = Testamentum Novum = Diatiqa chadata: est autem interpretatio Syriaca Novi Testamenti, Hebraeis typis descripta, plerisque etiam locis emendata: eadem Latino sermone reddita*. Geneva: Estienne, 1569.

Twisse, William. *Vindiciae gratiae, potestatis, ac providentiae Dei*. Amsterdam: Willem Blaeu, 1632.

Ursinus, Zacharias. *Explicationum catecheticarum absolutum opus, totiusque theologiae purioris quasi novum corpus*. Edited by David Pareus. Neustadt: Harnisch, 1598 (VD16 U 325). [English edition: *The Commentary of Dr. Zacharias Ursinus on the Heidelberg Catechism*. Translated by George W. Williard, 4th American edition. Cincinnati: Elm Street Printing Company, 1888.]

Ussher, James. *An Answer to a Challenge Made by a Iesuite in Ireland*. Dublin: Societie of Stationers, 1624.

———. *Archbishop Usher's Answer to a Jesuit: With Other Tracts on Popery*. Cambridge: Deighton, 1835.

Vermigli, Peter Martyr. *Commentary on the Nicomachean Ethics*. Peter Martyr Library 9. Edited by Emidio Campi and Joseph McLelland. Kirksville: Truman State University Press, 2006.

Voetius, Gisbertus, Carolus De Maets, and Johannes Hoornbeeck. *Res judicata, dat is: Extracten uyt de resolutien der synoden, ende oordelen der academien in dese Vereenichde Nederlanden over de negotie der ghenaemde lombarden*. Utrecht: Johannes van Waesberge, 1646.

———. *Disputationes selectae*. 5 vols. Utrecht: Joannes van Waesberge (vol. 1–3) / Amsterdam: Johannes Jansonius van Waesberge (vol. 4) / Utrecht: Antonius Smytegelt (vol. 5), 1648–1669.

———. *Politica ecclesiastica*. 3 volumes. Amsterdam: Van Waesberge, 1663–1676.

Vossius, Gerardus Joannes. "Ad lectorem." In *Historiae de controversiis, qua Pelagius eiusque reliquiae moverunt, libri septem*. Leiden: Joannes Patius, 1618.

Vrolikhert, Godewardus. *Vlissingsche Kerkhemel ofte Levensbeschryving van alle de hervormde leeraren, die, sedert den afval van Spanjen 1572, totop dezen tyd, in de Nederduytsche kerke van Vlissingen gearbeydt hebben*. Vlissingen: Pieter de Paaynaar, 1758.

Walaeus, Antonius. *Compendium ethicae Aristotelicae ad normam veritatis Christianae revocatum*. Leiden: Isaac Elsevir, 1620.

———. *Disputationum theologicarum trigesima-sexta, de cultu invocationis*, resp. Nicolaus Antonius Delienus. Leiden: Isaac Elzevir, 1623.

———. *Disputationum theologicarum quadragesima, de ecclesia*, resp. Jacobus Bosschaert. Leiden: Isaac Elzevir, 1623.

———. *Opera omnia*. Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643.

Widmanstadt, Johannes Albertus and Moses Mardenus. *Liber sacrosancti Evangelii de Iesu Christo Domino et Deo nostro*. Vienna: Zimmermann, 1555.

Wollebius, Johannes. *Christianae theologiae compendium*. Basel: Johann Jacob Genath, 1626 (VD17 1:063887P).

Secondary Literature

Abels, Paul H.A.M., and A.P.F. Wouters, *De grote kerkelijke vergadering van 's-Hertogenbosch in 1648*. 2 volumes. 's-Hertogenbosch: Rijksarchief, 1986.

Adam, Gottfried. *Der Streit um die Prädestination im ausgehenden 16. Jahrhundert: Eine Untersuchung zu den Entwürfen von Samuel Huber und Aegidius Hunnius*. Beiträge zur Geschichte und Lehre der Reformierten Kirche 30. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1970.

Albala, Ken. "The Ideology of Fasting in the Reformation Era." In *Food and Faith in Christian Culture*. Arts and Traditions of the Table. Edited by Ken Albala and Trudy Eden, 41–85. New York: Columbia University Press, 2011.

Antic, Radiša. "The Controversy over Fasting on Saturday between Constantinople and Rome." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 49.2 (2011): 337–352.

Appold, Kenneth G. *Abraham Calov's doctrine of* vocatio *in its systematic context*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 103. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Armstrong, Jonathan J. "From the κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας to the κανὼν τῶν γραφῶν: The Rule of Faith and the New Testament Canon." In *Tradition & the Rule of Faith in the Early Church: Essays in Honor of Joseph T. Lienhard S.J.* Edited by Ronnie J. Rombs and Alexander Y. Hwang, 30–47. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2010.

Asselt, Willem J. van. "The Fundamental Meaning of Theology: Archetypal and Ectypal Theology in Seventeenth-Century Reformed Thought." *Westminster Theological Journal* 64 (2002): 319–335.

———. *"Expromissio or Fideiussio?* A Seventeenth Century Theological Debate between Voetians and Cocceians about the Nature of Christ's Suretyship in Salvation History." *Mid-America Journal of Theology* 14 (2003): 37–57.

———, and Gert van den Brink (eds.), *Scholastic Discourse: Johannes Maccovius (1588–1644) on Theological and Philosophical Distinctions and Rules*. Publications of the Institute for Reformation Research. Apeldoorn: Instituut voor Reformatieonderzoek, 2009.

———, J. Martin Bac, and Roelf T. te Velde (eds.). *Reformed Thought on Freedom: The Concept of Free Choice in Early Modern Reformed Theology*. Texts and Studies in Reformation and Post-Reformation. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010.

———, and others. *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism*. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2011.

———. "'A Grievous Sin': Gisbertus Voetius (1589–1676) and his Anti-Lombard Polemic." In *Church and School in Early Modern Protestantism: Studies in Honor of Richard Muller on the Maturation of a Theological Tradition*. Edited by David Sytsma, Jordan J. Ballor, and Jason Zuidema, 505–520. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Backus, Irena. "The Bible and the Fathers according to Abraham Scultetus (1566–1624) and André Rivet (1571/73–1651). The case of Basil of Caesarea." In *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West. From the Carolingians to the Maurists*. Edited by Irena Backus, 2 volumes, 2:839–865. Boston / Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Bavinck, Herman *Reformed Dogmatics*. Translated by John Vriend, edited by John Bolt, 4 volumes. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003–2008.

Beck, Andreas J. *Gisbertus Voetius (1589–1676): Sein Theologieverständnis und seine Gotteslehre*. Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte 92. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007.

———. "'Expositio Reverentialis': Gisbertus Voetius's (1589–1676) Relationship With John Calvin." *Church History and Religious Culture* 91.1–2 (2011): 121–133.

Beeke, Joel. *The Quest for Full Assurance The Legacy of Calvin and His Successors*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1999.

Belt, Henk van den. *The Authority of Scripture in Reformed Theology: Truth and Trust* Studies in Reformed Theology 17. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

———. "The Vocatio in the Leiden Disputations (1597–1631): The Influence of the Arminian Controversy on the Concept of the Divine Call to Salvation." *Church History and Religious Culture*, 92.4 (2012): 539–559.

———. "Anabaptist Spirituality and the Heidelberg Catechism." In *The Spirituality of the Heidelberg Catechism: Papers of the International Conference on the Heidelberg Catechism Held in Apeldoorn 2013*. Refo500 Academic Studies 24. Edited by Arnold Huijgen, 50–61. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015.

———. "Developments in Structuring of Reformed Theology: The *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* (1625) as Example." In *Reformation und Rationalität*. Refo500 Academic Studies 17. Edited by Herman Selderhuis and Ernst-Joachim Waschke, 289–312. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015.

———. "Spiritual and Bodily Freedom: Christian Liberty in Early Modern Reformed Theology." *Journal of Reformed Theology* 9 (2015): 148–165.

Berkouwer, Gerrit Cornelis. *The Work of Christ*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965.

Berroit-Salvadore, Evelyne. "The discourse of medicine and science." In *A History of Women in the West: Renaissance and Enlightenment Paradoxes*. Volume 3, edited by G. Duby, M. Perrot, N. Zemon-Davis and P. Schmitt-Panel, 364–365. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.

Bie, Jan Pieter de, en Jakob Loosjes, *Biographisch woordenboek van protestantsche godgeleerden in Nederland*. 6 volumes. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1919–1931.

Bigane, John E. *Faith, Christ, or Peter: Matthew 16:18 in Sixteenth-Century Roman Catholic Exegesis*. Washington: University Press of America, 1981.

Binder, Wilhelm. *Novus thesaurus adagiorum latinorum: Lateinischer Sprichwörterschatz*. Stuttgart: Eduard Fischhaber, 1861.

Boer, William den. *God's Twofold Love. The Theology of Jacob Arminius (1559–1609)*. Reformed Historical Theology 14. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010.

Bos, Frans Lukas. *Johann Piscator: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der reformierten Theologie*. Kampen: Kok, 1932.

Brink, Gert van den. *Tot zonde gemaakt: De Engelse antinomiaanse controverse (1690–1700) over de toerekening van de zonden aan Christus, met bijzondere aandacht voor Herman Witsius'* Animadversiones Irenicae (*1696*). Kampen: Summum Academic, 2016.

Brown, Peter. *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography*. 2nd revised edition. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

Buitendag, Johan. "John Calvin's understanding of Christ's descent into hell." In *Restoration Through Redemption: John Calvin Revisited*. Studies in Reformed Theology 23. Edited by Henk van den Belt, 135–158. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Bynum, Carol Walker. *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200–1336*. Lectures on the History of Religions, New Series 15. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.

Cameron, Euan. *The European Reformation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Cancik, Hubert, and Helmuth Schneider (eds.). *Der Neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike / Altertum*. 18 volumes. Stuttgart-Weimar: J.B. Metzler, 1969–2003.

Candelaria, Lorenzo F. *The Rosary Cantoral: Ritual and Social Design in a Chantbook from Early Renaissance Toledo*. Eastman Studies in Music. Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2008.

Clancy, Patrick Michael J. "Fast and Abstinence." In *New Catholic Encyclopedia*. 2nd edition, 15 volumes, 5:632–635. Detroit: Gale, 2003.

Cohn, Norman. *The Pursuit of the Millennium: Revolutionary Millenarians and Mystical Anarchists of the Middle Ages*. Revised edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 1970.

Davis, Kenneth Ronald. *Anabaptism and Asceticism: A Study in Intellectual Origins*. Scottdale: Herald Press, 1974.

Deursen, Arie Theodorus van. *Bavianen en slijkgeuzen: Kerk en kerkvolk ten tijde van Maurits en Oldenbarnevelt*. 3rd edition. Franeker: Van Wijnen, 1998.

Douie, Decima. "John XXII and the Beatific Vision." *Dominican Studies* 3 (1950): 154–174.

Drobner, Hubert R. *The Fathers of the Church: A Comprehensive Introduction*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 2007.

Estep, William R. *The Anabaptist Story: An Introduction to Sixteenth-Century Anabaptist*. 3rd edition. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.

Fornerod, Nicolas. *Registres de la Compagnie des pasteurs de Genève: Tome 14 et dernier (1618–1619) le synode de Dordrecht*. Travaux d'humanisme et Renaissance 511. Geneva: Droz, 2012.

Gootjes, Albert. *Claude Pajon (1626–1685) and the Academy of Saumur: The First Controversy over Grace*. Brill's Series in Church History 64. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

Grant, Edward. *Planets, Stars, and Orbs: The Medieval Cosmos, 1200–1687*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Grillmeier, Aloys. *Christ in Christian Tradition*. Volume 2: From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590–604), part 4: The Church of Alexandria with Nubia and Ethiopia after 451. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996.

Gründler, Otto. "From Seed to Fruition: Calvin's Notion of the *semen fidei* and Its Aftermath in Reformed Orthodoxy." In *Probing the Reformed Tradition: Historical Essays in Honor of Edward A. Dowey Jr*. Edited by Elsie Anne McKee and Brian G. Armstrong, 108–115. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1989.

Haag, Eugène and Émile. *La France protestante*, 10 volumes. Paris: Joel Cherbuliez, 1846–1858.

Haga, Joar. *Was there a Lutheran Metaphysics?: The Interpretation of* communicatio idiomatum *in Early Modern Lutheranism*. Refo500 Academic Studies 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012.

Harrill, J. Albert. *The Manumission of Slaves in Early Christianity*. Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie 32. Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995.

Henderson, Robert W. *The Teaching Office in the Reformed Tradition: A History of the Doctoral Ministry*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, [1962].

Henninger, Mark G. *Relations: Medieval Theories 1250–1325*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

Heppe, Heinrich. *Die Dogmatik der evangelisch-reformierte Kirche dargestellt und aus den Quellen belegt*. 2nd edition by Ernst Bizer. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1958. [English edition: *Reformed Dogmatics: Set Out and Illustrated from the Sources*. Translated by G.T. Thomson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.]

Herdt, Jennifer. *Putting on Virtue: The Legacy of the Splendid Vices*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008.

Heyd, David. *Supererogation: Its Status in Ethical Theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Heyd, Michael. *"Be Sober and Reasonable": The Critique of Enthusiasm in the Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries*. Brill's Studies in Intellectual History 63. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

Hoek, Jan. "'Euthanasia' in the seventeenth century: *Ars Moriendi* in Dutch Reformed Perspective." In *Strangers and Pilgrims on the Earth: Essays in Honour of Abraham van de Beek*. Studies in Reformed theology. Edited by Paul van Geest and Eduardus van der Borght, 329–341. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Honders, Huibert Jacob. *Andreas Rivetus als invloedrijk theoloog in Hollands bloeitijd*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1930.

Irwin, Terence H. "Splendid Vices? Augustine for and against Pagan Virtues." *Medieval Philosophy and Theology* 8 (1999): 105–127.

Jedin, Hubert. *Geschichte des Konzils von Trient*. Volume 2: Die erste Trienter Tagungsperiode 1545/47. Freiburg: Herder, 1957.

Jones, Mark. "John Calvin's Reception at the Westminster Assembly (1643–1649)." *Church History and Religious Culture* 91 (2011): 215–227.

Jurgens, William A. *The Faith of the Early Fathers*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1970.

Kaplan, Benjamin J. *Calvinists and Libertines: Confession and Community in Utrecht 1578–1620*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.

Kelly, John Norman Davidson. *Early Christian Doctrines*. 3rd edition. London: Continuum, 2007.

Kolb, Robert. *Bound Choice, Election, and Wittenberg Theological Method: From Martin Luther to the Formula of Concord*. Lutheran Quarterly Books. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

Kraut, Richard. *Aristotle on the Human Good*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.

Kreitzer, Beth. *Reforming Mary: Changing Images of the Virgin Mary in Lutheran Sermons of the Sixteenth Century*. Oxford Studies in Historical Theology. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Krop, Henri A. "Philosophy and the Synod of Dordt: Aristotelianism, Humanism and the Case against Arminianism." In *Revisiting the Synod of Dordt (1618–1619)*. Brill's Series in Church History 49. Edited by Aza Goudriaan and Fred A. van Lieburg, 49–79. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Lametti, David. "The objects of virtue." In *Property and Community*. Edited by Gregory S. Alexander and Eduardo M. Peñalver, 1–37. New York / Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Lane, Anthony N.S. "A Tale of Two Imperial Cities: Justification at Regensburg (1541) and Trent (1546–1547)." In *Justification in Perspective: Historical Developments and Contemporary Challenges*. Edited by Bruce L. McCormack, 119–145. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006.

Le Goff, Jacques. "Head or Heart? The Political Use of Body Metaphors in the Middle Ages." In *Fragments for a History of the Human Body*. Edited by Michel Feher, 3 volumes, 3:13–26. New York: Urzone, 1989.

———. *The Birth of Purgatory*. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer. London: Scholar Press, 1990.

Lieburg, Fred A. van. *Repertorium van Nederlandse hervormde predikanten tot 1816*. 2 volumes. Dordrecht: Van Lieburg, 1996.

———. "Re-Understanding the Dordt Church Order in its Dutch Political, Ecclesiasti-

cal and Cultural Context (1559–1816)." In *Protestant Church Polity in Changing Contexts: Ecclesiological and Historical Contributions. Proceedings of the International Conference, Utrecht, The Netherlands, 7–10 November, 2011*. Edited by Allan J. Janssen and Leo J. Koffeman, 2 volumes, 1:117–136. Zürich: LIT-Verlag, 2014.

Lind van Wijngaarden, Jan Daniël de. *Antonius Walaeus*. Leiden: Los, 1891.

Mäkinen, Virpi. *Property Rights in the Late Medieval Discussion on Franciscan Poverty*. Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie Médiévales, Bibliotheca 3. Leuven: Peeters, 2001.

Mahlmann, Theodor. "Articulus stantis et (vel) cadentis ecclesiae." In *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. 4th edition, edited by Hans D. Betz, Don S. Browning, Bernd Janowski and Eberhard Jüngel, 8 volumes, 1:1998. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998–2007.

Maruyama, Tadataka. *The Ecclesiology of Theodore Beza: The Reform of the True Church*. Travaux d'humanisme et Renaissance 166. Geneva: Droz, 1998.

McClure, Judith, and Roger Collins (eds.). *The Ecclesiastical History of the English People*. World's Classics. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

McGinnis, Andrew. *The Son of God Beyond the Flesh: A Historical and Theological Study of the Extra Calvinisticum*. T&T Clark Studies in Systematic Theology 29. London / New York: Bloomsbury / T&T Clark, 2014.

McGrath, Alister E. *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*. Third edition. Cambridge University Press, 2005.

McGuckin, John A. *St. Cyril of Alexandria: The Christological Controversy*. New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2004.

Meijer, Theodorus Josephus, and Sybrandus Johannes Fockema Andreae, *Album studiosorum academiae franekerensis* (*1585–1811, 1816–1844*). Franeker: Wever, 1968.

Milton, Anthony. *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1640*. Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Monson, Don. A., *Andreas Capellanus, Scholasticism, and the Courtly Tradition*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2005.

Muller, Richard A. "Establishing the Ordo docendi: The Organization of Calvin's Institutes, 1536–1559." In Richard A. Muller, *The Unaccommodated Calvin: Studies in the Foundation of a Theological Tradition*, 118–139. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

———. "The Placement of Predestination in Reformed Theology: Issue or Non-Issue?" *CTJ* 40 (2005): 184–210.

———. *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition: On the Work of Christ and the Order of Salvation*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.

Nagtglas, Frederick. *De algemeene kerkeraad der Nederduitsch-Hervormde Gemeente te Middelburg van 1574–1860*. Middelburg: Altorffer, 1860.

Noonan, F. Thomas, and Margaret Kieckhefer. *The Road to Jerusalem: Pilgrimage and Travel in the Age of Discovery*. Material Texts. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.

Oberman, Heiko A. *The Harvest of Medieval Theology: Gabriel Biel and Late Medieval Nominalism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963.

———. "Introduction: The Church." In *Forerunners of the Reformation: The Shape of Late Medieval Thought*. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 2002.

Opstal, Alexander Gijsbert van. *André Rivet. Een invloedrijk hugenoot aan het hof van Frederik Hendrik*. Harderwijk: [s.n.], 1937.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. *Mary through the Centuries: Her Place in the History of Culture*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.

Parker, Charles H. *The Reformation of Community: Social Welfare and Calvinist Charity in Holland*, 1572–1620. Cambridge Studies in Early Modern History. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Partee, Charles. *Calvin and Classical Philosophy*. Leiden: Brill, 1977.

Pels, Dick. *Property and Power in Social Theory: A Study in Intellectual Rivalry*. Routledge Studies in Social and Political Thought 14. London / New York: Routledge, 1998.

Peter, Carl. "The Church's Treasures (*thesauri Ecclesiae*) Then and Now." *Theological Studies* 47 (1986): 251–272.

Pierson, Christopher. *Just Property. A History in the Latin West*. Volume 1: Wealth, Virtue and the Law. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Pope, Stephen J. (ed.). *The Ethics of Aquinas*. Moral Traditions Series. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 2002.

Rabin, Andrew. "Bede, Dryhthelm, and the Witness to the Other World: Testimony and Conversion in the *Historia Ecclesiastica*." *Modern Philology* 106/3 (2009): 375–398.

Rahner, Karl. "Contrition." In *Encyclopaedia of Theology: A Concise Sacramentum Mundi*. Edited by Karl Rahner, 288–291. London: Burns & Oates, 1975.

Ray, Stephen K. *Upon This Rock: St. Peter and the Primacy of Rome in Scripture and the Early Church*. Modern Apologetics Library. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1999.

Reeling Brouwer, Rinse H. *Karl Barth and Post-Reformation Orthodoxy*. Farnham / Burlington: Ashgate, [2015].

Rieu, Willem N. du, ed. *Album studiosorum academia Lugduno-Batavae mdlxxv–mdccclxxv*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1875.

Rogge, Joachim. *Johann Agricolas Lutherverständnis unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Antinomismus*. Berlin: Evangelische Verlaganstalt, 1960.

Santing, Catrien, and Barbara Baert. *Disembodied Heads in Medieval and Early Modern Culture*. Intersections 28. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Selderhuis, Herman J. (ed.), *Handbook of Dutch Church History*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015.

Sepp, Christiaan. *Het godgeleerd onderwijs in Nederland, gedurende de 16e en 17e eeuw*. 2 Volumes. Leiden: De Breuk en Smits, 1873–1874.

Sinnema, Donald W., and Henk van den Belt. "The *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* (1625) as a Disputation Cycle." *Church History and Religious Culture* 92.4 (2012): 505–537.

———. "The Issue of Reprobation at the Synod of Dort (1618–19) in Light of the History of this Doctrine" (Ph.D. dissertation, Toronto School of Theology, 1985).

———, Christian Moser, and Herman J. Selderhuis (ed.), *Acta of the Synod of Dordt*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015.

Stayer, James. *The German Peasants' War and Anabaptist Community of Goods*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's Studies in the History of Religion 6. McGill-Queen's University Press, 1991.

Steinmetz, David C. *Calvin in Context*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Strehle, Stephen. *The Catholic Roots of the Protestant Gospel: Encounters between the Middle Ages and the Reformation*, Studies in the History of Christian Thought 60. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

Tan, Seng-Kong. "Trinitarian Action in the Incarnation." In *Jonathan Edwards as Contemporary: Essays in Honor of Sang Hyun Lee*. Edited by Don Schweitzer, 127–150. New York [etc.]: Peter Lang, 2010.

Tavard, George H. "Calvin and the Nicodemites." In *John Calvin and Roman Catholicism: Critique and Engagement, Then and Now*. Edited by Randal C. Zachmann, 59–78. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.

Thouzellier, Christine. "Ecclesia militans." In *Études d'histoire du droit canonique dédiées à Gabriel le Bras*. 2 volumes, 2:1407–1424. Paris: Sirey, 1965.

Tilley, Maureen A. *Donatist Martyr Stories: The Church in Conflict in Roman North Africa*. Translated Texts for Historians 24. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1996.

Veen, Mirjam G.K. van. "Spiritualism in The Netherlands: From David Joris to Dirck Volckertsz Coornhert." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 33 (2002): 129–150.

———, and Jesse Sponholz, "Calvinists vs. Libertines: A New Look at Religious Exile and the Origins of 'Dutch' Tolerance." In *Calvinism and the Making of the European Mind*. Studies in Reformed Theology 27. Edited by Gijsbert van den Brink and Harro M. Höpfl, 76–99. Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2014.

Velde, Dolf te. *The Doctrine of God in Reformed Orthodoxy, Karl Barth, and the Utrecht School: A Study in Method and Content*. Studies in Reformed Theology 25. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

———. "Introduction." in *Synopsis purioris theologiae = Synopsis of a purer theology*. Edited by Dolf te Velde, 3 volumes, 1:1–22. Leiden: Brill, 2014–.

Venema, Cornelis P. "Calvin's Doctrine of the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness: Another Example of 'Calvin Against The Calvinists'?" *Mid-America Journal of Theology* 20 (2009): 15–47.

Vermeij, Rienk. *The Calvinist Copernicans. The Reception of the New Astronomy in the Dutch Republic, 1575–1750*. History of Science and Scholarship in the Netherlands 1. Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, 2002.

Vogelsang, Erich. "Weltbild und Kreuzestheologie in den Höllenfahrtsstreitigkeiten der Reformationszeit." *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 38 (1941): 90–132.

Vollert, Cyril. "Transubstantiation." In *New Catholic Encyclopedia*. 2nd edition, 15 volumes, 14:158–160. Detroit: Gale, 2003.

Vos, Antonie, and others (eds.), *Duns Scotus on Divine Love: Texts and Commentary on Goodness and Freedom, God and Humans*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.

Williams, George Huntston. *The Radical Reformation*. 3rd rev. ed. Kirksville: Truman State University Press, 2000.

Zijlstra, Samme. *Om de ware gemeente en de oude gronden: geschiedenis van de dopersen in de Nederlanden 1531–1675*. Hilversum: Fryske Akademy & Verloren, 2000.

Scripture Index

Genesis

2:17 26.8, 33.14
3:3 33.14
3:15 25.16, 25.19
3:19 37.18, 38.41
4:14 36.38
4:26 36.38n27
12:3 25.16
15:6 29.35
17:13–14 35.23
18 36.25
18:25 29.34
22:14 36.38n27
22:18 25.16
26:3–4 25.16
28 38.23
28:12 36.7
28:14 25.16
28:16 36.38
28:20 38.22, 38.23
28:20–22 38.17
35:1 36.38
49:10 25.16, 25.23

Exodus

3 36.49
3:12 36.38
14:15 36.30
20:9 38.41
20 :24 29.23
22:22 37.22
22:25 37.34
22:26 37.34
23:1 33.31
24:8 29.23
24:18 37.41
25:40 35.21
28 29.24
29:14 29.24n12
29:36 29.24n12
32:32 36.50
34:28 37.41

Leviticus

1:4 29.24
10:18 37.22
16 26.43n29
16:9 39.26
16:21 29.24
16:29 37.43, 37.52
19:10 37.22 note c
23:27 37.43
23:32 37.43, 37.48
25:35–37 37.34
27 38.4

Numbers

6 38.37
6:24 ff. 36.33
28:22 29.24
30 38.4, 38.28

Deuteronomy

4:8 35.23
4:37 24.9
9:18 36.35, 37.56
10:16 32.22n24
12:32 34.12
15:4 37.19, 37.21n15
15:7–18 37.9
15:8 37.33
21:22–23 35.28
21:23 27.5
23 38.50
23:19–20 37.35
24:10 37.34
25:1 33.2, 33.31
27:26 35.13, 39.20
28:13 37.35
28:22 37.20
28:44 37.35
30:6 32.22n21

Joshua

8:30 36.38
11:15 34.33
24:23 38.14
24:24 38.19

Judges

11:30–31 38.21

1 Samuel
1:11 38.17, 38.19, 38.23
1:13 36.30
7:6 37.53
10:24 24.9
14:24 37.40
14:36 36.38
31:13 37.48

2 Samuel
7 25.16, 36.25
12:16 36.35, 37.53
12:23 40.19

1 Kings
2:19 28.23
5:17 41.37
8:35 32.33
8:39 36.5, 40.28
14:8 34.33
18:36 36.38
19:4–5 37.41
21:27 37.53
21:27–29 37.56

2 Kings
2:1 28.12, 28.18
2:11 28.18, 40.15
22:20 36.17, 36.8, 40.19
23:25 34.33
25 37.43

2 Chronicles
3:3 41.37
6:13 36.35
15:12 34.33
24:4–6 42.72

Ezra
6:21–22 3752
8:21 37.45, 37.52
9:3 37.53
9:5 36.35, 37.52
10:5 38.14

Nehemiah
1:4 36.30, 37.51
8:11 37.52
8:13 37.52
9 32.45
9:5 36.35

Esther
4:16 37.48
9:31–32 37.43
14:2 37.53

Job
1:6 26.36
1:21 36.47
2:1 26.36
3:3 36.50
7:10 40.19
14:4 25.20
14:21 36.17, 36.8, 40.19
24:19 39.34
31:1 38.23
34:36 36.51
35:7 34.41
41:2 34.41
42:6 36.35

Psalms
1:2 32.39, 35.45
1:3 31.36
1:4 41.39
2:6 41.10
2:7–8 28.29
2:12 31.18
7:27 34.33
16 40.18
16:10 27.13, 29.16
16:11 40.13
18:5 27.8
19:4 30.4
19:12 32.46
19:14 36.27
22:7 29.14
23 40.18
24:1 37.10
25:1 36.27
32 32.45
32:1 33.21, 33.8
33:11 24.16
33:13–14 40.20
34 38.21
34:2 38.16
35:13 37.52, 37.53

Psalms (*cont.*)
37:24 31.36
37:26 37.33
40:6 29.7
40:8 29.7
41:2 37.17
45:10 28.23
47 25.35
50 38.50
50:14–15 36.2
51:7 25.20
51:10 32.22n22
55:18 36.43
59:10 37.Cor1
65:6 36.13
68:18 28.17
76 38.50
76:11 38.23
78:22 31.18
83:3 27.8
84 40.18
86:16 27.8
89:32–33 39.41
97:7 36.13n11
101 38.21
101:1–2 38.16
106:30 34.33
110:1 28.27
110:4 26.16
112:9 37.37
115:3 30.48
116:3 27.8
116:12 38.23n6
116:13 37.52
116:14 38.23n6
119 34.33
119:11 34.33
119:18 32.39
119:36 32.23
119:55 37.58
119:62 37.58
123:2 36.27
125:1 31.36
130:1 36.27
130:3 33.Cor1
130:4 32.39, 33.12, 33.Cor1
137 36.43
139:2 36.5
141:2 36.27
142:3 36.27
143:2 33.16, 33.3, 34.30
147:20 41.39

Proverbs
3:5 31.18
8:22–23 25.10
9:12 39.45
12:12 37.37
13:8 39.35
14:21 37.37
17:15 33.2, 33.31
19:17 37.10, 37.37
21:13 37.10
22:2 37.10, 37.6
22:7 37.34
30:8–9 36.49

Ecclesiastes
9:2 36.8
12:7 40.9

Song of Solomon
4:7 40.30

Isaiah
1:16 36.23
2 41.29
2:2 25.23
2:2–3 41.10
6:3 36.14
6:9 36.14n13
7:14 25.19
7:14–15 25.22
7:16 25.13
8:18 41.7
8:19 39.34
9:14–15 41.35
9:5 25.32
9:6 25.40, 41.7
11:1 25.16
11:1–3 25.30
26:6 37.17
28:16 41.11
29:13 34.13
42:1 24.24
43:25 33.12, 33.9
49 24.30
49:6 26.40

52:1 40.30
53 25.40, 26.16, 29.13, 33.13
53:3 29.14
53:4 29.5, 29.25
53:5 29.10, 29.26, 29.32
53:6 29.26, 39.21
53:7 29.7
53:8 29.10
53:9 29.35
53:10 26.14, 29.5, 29.7, 29.26, 41.7
53:11 29.15, 29.25, 29.32, 31.17, 33.26, 33.9
53:12 29.7
54:11 41.23
54:13 30.31n16
57:1 39.13
57:2 40.19
58:3 37.52
58:5 37.53
58:5–6 37.55
58:6 37.42
58:7 37.10, 37.26
58:11 37.37
59:20 32.33
60 24.30
61:2 39.53
63:16 36.8n7
64:2 36.8
64:6 36.8n7
66 24.30

Jeremiah
1 36.49
6:30 24.45
14:7 36.5
14:12 37.42
16:19 32.33
20:14 36.50
23:21 42.5, 42.13
23:5–6 29.35
23:6 33.18, 33.19
31:35–36 40.31
31:36 40.23
33:16 29.35, 33.19
34:15 35.9
35 38.37
52 37.43

Ezekiel
14:20 39.45
20:18–19 34.12
34:23 41.9
36:26 32.22n20, 32.22n23
37:24 41.9

Daniel
2:34–35 41.11
2:45 41.11
4:27 37.4, 37.37
6:11 36.38, 36.43
7:13 28.17
9 36.25
9:3 37.45
9:24 25.23, 29.35
10:2 37.48
10:3 37.45, 37.48
12:3 33.10

Hosea
5:1 41.35
6:6 37.4

Joel
1:14 37.42, 37.51
2:12 37.52, 37.53
2:12–13 37.53
2:15 37.42
2:16 37.53
2:28 30.31n16

Jonah
3:7 37.53
3:9 37.56

Micah
5:1 25.23

Habakkuk
1:13 36.15

Zechariah
1:12 28.34
3:2 ff. 28.33
5:3 37.43
7:5 37.42, 37.47, 37.55
7:9 37.55
8:19 37.43, 37.52

Zechariah (*cont.*)
9:9 41.10
12 26.16
12:10 36.28

Malachi
1:11 36.39

Matthew
1:1 25.17
1:1–17 25.17
1:18 25.6, 25.19
1:19–20 25.19
1:20 25.6, 25.19
1:21 24.28, 25.40, 27.2, 27.23, 40.30
1:25 25.19
2:1 25.23
2:5 25.23
3:4 37.41
3:9 40.5
3:10 28.18
3:12 28.18, 40.35n24
3:15 29.35
4:2 25.13, 37.41
4:10 36.4
4:18–19 41.17
5:2 ff. 26.39
5:3 37.6, 40.13
5:6 37.50
5:8 40.13
5:10 40.13
5:16 34.18
5:22 39.20, 39.30
5:23–24 36.24
5:25 39.29
5:29–30 35.40
5:34–44 37.23
5:42 37.17, 37.22n17, 37.23n18, 37.33
5:44–45 36.52
6:1–2 37.28
6:1–5 37.1
6:4 37.28, 37.37
6:5 37.51
6:5–6 36.41
6:6 36.40
6:7 36.32, 36.32n22
6:9 36.25, 36.4
6:12 36.24
6:13 36.25
6:15 36.25
6:16 37.1, 37.42, 37.53
6:16–17 37.54
6:18 37.56
6:32 36.5
7:12 37.4, 42.13
7:13 39.10
7:15 40.42
7:16 40.46
7:22 31.7
7:23 24.47
7:24–25 31.36
8:11 27.28, 40.15
8:20 25.15
8:24 25.13
9:2 31.26, 33.26, 33.9
9:6 33.9, 39.16
9:13 30.16, 32.11, 37.4
9:14 37.41
9:15 37.42, 37.44, 37.52, 41.5
9:22 31.18
9:27 41.22
9:38 42.5
7:13–14 24.30
10:1 31.7, 42.21
10:10 37.25
10:18 41.17
10:23 25.15
10:25 41.6
10:28 40.9
10:32 41.27
10:36 41.6
10:37 35.40
10:41 37.37
10:42 37.13
11:3 41.22
11:19 25.13
11:27 41.23
11:28 30.11
11:30 34.33
12:18 24.24
12:32 39.8, 39.17n31
12:35 34.6n6
12:37 33.36
12:40 27.15
13 24.36
13:19 30.35

13:20 30.37
13:21 31.3n7
13:22 30.36
13:23 30.38
13:24–30 40.27n18, 40.35n23
13:36–43 40.27n18
13:47–50 40.35n22
14:23 36.40
14:26 25.11
14:33 41.22
15:9 34.13
15:22 41.22
15:24 26.40
16:15 41.21
16:16 41.21
16:17 31.24
16:18 40.23, 40.31, 41.11
16:18–19 41.20
16:19 39.16, 42.Cor3
16:22–23 41.25
17:2 28.14
17:5 38.42
17:12 25.32
17:20–21 37.56
18 41.27
18:1 41.39
18:10 36.6
18:15 41.26
18:15–17 42.26
18:17 32.52, 40.25, 40.36, 40.39, 41.26
18:17–18 42.40, 42.Cor4
18:18 33.10, 41.26, 42.20
18:19 36.31
18:19–20 36.40
18:20 40.25
18:23 36.24
19:14 31.13
19:21 37.16
19:28 41.17
20:16 24.9, 24.30
20:8 40.10
20:16 30.39
20:19 25.32
20:21 28.23, 41.39
20:26 41.39
20:28 29.21, 29.28, 29.29, 33.13
21:5 41.10
21:29 32.30, 32.30n32
21:42 41.11
22:1–14 40.35n25
22:4 30.39
22:39 37.15
22:42 25.34
23:9 41.7
23:14 36.32
24:7 37.40
24:13 31.30
24:22 24.17
24:23 31.18
24:24 24.17, 24.38, 31.33, 31.36, 40.31
24:26 31.18
25:34 24.15
24:42 37.58
24:47 40.21
25 37.38
25:11 ff. 32.53
25:32 39.10
25:34 37.37
25:35 34.26, 37.26
25:36 37.22
25:40 37.11
26:2 25.32
26:11 37.6
26:13 42.10
26:28 29.29, 29.32
26:33–34 41.25
26:35 41.28
26:37 27.4n5, 29.17
26:37–38 27.6
26:38 25.13, 37.58, 37.58
26:39 27.6, 36.32
26:41 37.58
26:42 27.6, 36.32
26:44 27.6
26:64 28.27
27:44 27.29
27:46 27.6, 29.17, 36.32, 36.33
27:53 28.17
28 28.28
28:18 25.38, 28.27, 41.13, 41.26
28:18–19 41.26
28:19 41.27, 42.18, 42.21, 42.26
28:19–20 40.48
28:20 40.23, 40.44, 42.10, 42.40, 42.65

Mark

1:15 32.41
2:8 26.19
2:20 37.44
3:16 41.23
4:17 31.3n7
5:36 31.18
8:29 41.21
8:34 37.16
8:36 37.16
9:24 31.21
9:33 41.39
10:24 37.6
10:35 41.39
11:24 36.26
12:41 37.15
12:44 37.14
13:32 25.27, 36.6
13:35 37.58
14:33 29.17
14:33–34 27.6
14:36 27.6
14:39 27.6
14:62 28.27
14:7 37.28, 37.9
15:15 29.2
16:15 28.10, 41.27
16:16 31.18, 31.30, 41.26
16:19 28.15

Luke

1:5 42.72
1:6 33.35, 34.33
1:19 36.7
1:31–32 26.16, 41.10
1:35 25.6, 25.8, 25.18, 25.20, 25.25, 29.35
1:42 25.19
1:56 25.22
1:72 35.8
1:74 35.8, 35.42
1:77 31.17
2:1 25.23
2:4 25.23
2:6 25.22
2:7 25.40
2:10–11 26.16
2:14 26.6
2:23 25.22
2:29 39.13
2:32 26.40
2:37 37.51
2:40 25.13, 25.22
2:42 25.22
2:49 26.16
2:52 25.27, 25.30
3:11 37.26
3:17 40.35n24
3:23–38 25.17
3:38 25.15
4:19 39.53
5:11 33.9
5:34 37.44
6:12 37.58
6:13 24.9
6:27 37.23
6:30 37.23n18
6:32 37.23
6:33 37.28
6:35 37.33
7:47 34.26
8:2–3 37.25
8:5 33.25
8:11 31.12
8:15 34.10
8:50 31.18
9:20 41.21
9:31 40.15
9:46 41.39
10:1 42.23
10:21–23 41.23
10:28 35.13
10:29 33.16
10:30 37.23
11:1–4 31.41
11:2 36.33
11:27 25.22
11:41 37.14, 37.37
12:32 24.30, 24.30n24, 37.38
12:33 37.16, 37.37
12:39 37.58
12:58 39.29
12:59 39.29n47
13:25 41.6
14:12 37.17, 37.26
14:13 37.22
14:13–14 37.37
16:8 39.10

16:9 37.27n20, 37.37
16:10–12 37.10
16:11 31.18
16:15 33.16
16:20 37.19
16:22 27.28, 39.15
17:9 32.45
17:9–10 34.40
17:10 34.41
18:1 36.42
18:12 37.14, 37.47
18:13 36.35
18:14 36.25
18:22 37.37
18:35 37.19
19:8 37.14
19:41 25.13
20:36 35.43
20:47 36.32
21:1 37.32
21:4 37.13
21:34 37.41
22:24 41.39
22:26 41.39
22:31–34 41.25
22:42 25.27, 29.7
22:42–44 27.6
22:43–44 29.17
22:44 25.13
23:40–43 32.6n5
23:41 39.14
23:43 27.29, 28.18, 40.15
24:25 26.13
24:27 42.13
24:31 28.14
24:39 25.11, 25.12, 28.5
24:51 28.15

John

1:1 25.10
1:1–3 25.32
1:12 26.5, 31.18, 31.20, 31.26, 33.24
1:14 25.5, 25.8, 25.9, 25.10
1:29 29.27, 41.22
1:34–35 41.22
1:39–40 41.17
1:41 41.22
1:42 41.23
1:45 41.22
1:49 41.22
2:19 28.7, 29.20
2:24–25 25.27
3:5 32.4
3:6 25.18
3:13 25.21, 25.35, 25.38
3:16 26.6, 26.7, 29.5, 29.8, 29.36, 31.21, 33.11
3:29 41.5, 41.33
3:34 25.30, 26.51
4:23–24 36.39
4:6 25.13
4:29 41.22
4:42 41.22
5:4 36.16n14
5:24 39.12, 39.15
5:29 39.10
5:36 26.16
5:44 31.37
5:46 35.27
6:27 26.16
6:33 25.38
6:35 25.41
6:38 25.38
6:41 25.21
6:41–42 25.38
6:44 30.43, 35.44
6:45 30.31
6:50–51 25.38
6:51 25.41, 33.13
6:58 25.38, 28.13
6:62 25.35, 28.13
6:63 30.29
6:68–69 41.22
6:69 31.21
8:32 35.9
8:33 35.3
8:36 35.4
8:42 26.16
8:44 26.36
8:47 40.46
8:58 25.10
9:31 36.23
10:4–5 40.46, 41.9
10:8 42.50n27
10:9 41.37
10:11–12 41.9
10:14 24.12, 40.28
10:15 27.23, 29.7, 31.34

John (*cont.*)
10:16 40.30, 41.9
10:18 27.19, 28.7, 29.7, 29.20
10:25 26.16
10:26 24.28, 24.47
10:28 31.34
10:30 25.27
12:6 37.7
12:43 31.37
13:13–14 41.8
13:13–17 25.14
13:29 37.7
14:2 28.12, 28.13, 28.20
14:6 28.34, 30.9, 36.19
14:13 28.34, 36.19
14:16 28.34, 41.13
14:17 31.36
14:21 34.33
14:26 41.13
14:31 27.19
15:1–8 34.18
15:2 32.25
15:5 34.9
15:8 34.16
15:13 29.9
15:19 24.10, 24.47
15:22 24.55, 32.8
15:26 41.13
16:7 28.20
16:8 33.9
16:11 33.9
16:13 42.21
16:23 36.19
16:28 28.15
16:33 31.18
17:1 36.35
17:3 30.9, 31.17, 33.26, 33.26n16
17:5 28.28, 40.18
17:8 26.39
17:9 24.47
17:11 28.34
17:15 28.34, 31.26
17:19 27.21, 29.35
17:24 28.34, 39.15n28
18:11 29.7
20:17 26.5
20:21 41.17
20:21–23 41.26
20:23 42.Cor3
20:27 25.12
21 41.27
21:15 41.20

Acts
1 28.17
1:3 28.10
1:9 28.10, 28.15
1:10 28.16
1:11 28.15
1:24 36.7n6
2:2 ff. 42.21
2:17 30.31
2:24 27.32n36, 28.7
2:24–25 29.20
2:27 27.13, 29.16
2:28 25.41
2:30 25.16, 25.34
2:33 28.34
2:44 37.7
3:2 37.19
3:15 29.20
3:19 32.40
3:20–21 28.19
4:11 41.11
4:19 35.40
4:24 35.40, 36.14
4:28 24.4, 24.6, 27.16
4:32 37.7
4:35 37.7
5:4 37.7
5:15 42.63
5:23 41.3
5:29 35.40
5:31 32.4
5:41 36.47
6:1 37.32
6:3 42.20
6:4 42.65
7 42.66
7:56 28.19n17
7:60 36.45
8 42.66
8:5 42.67
8:14 41.18
8:27 42.67
8:39–40 42.67
9:1–19 32.6n6
9:5 42.24

9:14 36.13
10 ff. 42.54
10:2–4 37.1
10:9 36.43
10:30 37.45
10:38–39 26.16
10:43 31.20, 33.21
11:2 41.18
11:18 32.4, 32.40, 42.42
11:23 42.43
11:28 42.22
12:5 36.45
13 30.24
13:1 42.22
13:2 37.51
13:2–3 37.45
13:3 42.66
13:22 34.33
13:35 27.13
13:38 24.58n46
13:38–39 33.5, 33.21
13:39 33.15, 33.34
13:48 24.38
14:9 31.4
14:14 42.24
14:15 25.14n12, 36.17n16
14:23 37.45, 42.33
14:27 24.55
15:2 42.62
15:8 36.7n6
15:9 32.18, 33.29, 33.35, 34.9, 35.35, 37.38, 37.Cor1
15:11 33.19
15:18 24.46
15:28 41.17
16 30.24
16:3 35.24, 35.37
16:6–7 30.26
16:10 30.26
16:14 31.9
16:25 37.58
16:34–35 33.35
17:22 40.8n5
17:26 25.15
17:27 30.3
18:9 28.19n17
18:10 24.28
18:18 38.18, 38.32
18:27 42.43
19:32 40.1
19:39 40.1
20:1 42.25
20:21 32.41
20:28 25.35, 26.51n36, 27.20, 29.14, 29.29, 33.13, 41.39, 42.29, 42.57
20:36 36.35, 42.26
21:10 42.22
21:26 35.24
22:17 28.19n17
23:14 37.40
24:14 42.11
26:18 32.33, 33.25
26:22 42.11
27:33 37.40
28:23 42.11
28:25 36.14

Romans

1 32.11
1:1 42.12
1:3 25.8, 25.20, 25.35
1:3–4 26.19
1:4 28.7
1:7 36.13
1:14 30.31
1:16 31.11, 33.32
1:17 33.10, 33.18, 33.25, 33.32
1:18 24.22, 24.56, 30.7
1:20 24.55, 30.3, 32.8, 39.28
1:21 39.28
1:26 24.56
1:28 24.56
1:32 29.34
2:1 24.55, 32.8
2:2 34.15
2:4 32.6
2:5 32.37, 32.40
2:6–8 34.47
2:7 34.15
2:13 33.4
2:14 30.4, 34.15
2:29 24.35, 32.22n21, 32.2n3
3:5–6 29.34
3:9–12 24.21
3:19 24.21
3:20 33.5, 33.15, 33.16, 33.35
3:20–21 33.5

Romans (*cont.*)
3:21 33.18
3:21–22 33.18
3:22 29.35, 33.25, 33.34
3:23 33.17
3:24 33.12, 33.14, 33.17, 33.19
3:24–25 33.13, 33.18
3:24–26 33.7
3:25 26.7, 26.7n4, 26.8, 29.14, 29.32, 29.36, 32.47, 33.14
3:25–26 29.8, 29.30
3:26 33.32, 33.34, 33.5, 33.9
3:27 33.33
3:28 33.5, 33.16, 33.25, 33.Ant11n31
3:30 33.5, 33.9, 33.25
3:31 33.31
4 33.12, 33.22, 33.Ant11, 33.Ant12
4:2 33.15, 33.16, 33.21, 33.36
4:3 29.2n2, 33.21, 33.27, 33.4
4:4 33.22
4:4–5 33.17
4:4–6 33.5
4:5 33.27, 33.34, 33.Ant10
4:5–6 33.17
4:6 33.4, 33.16
4:7 33.8
4:8 33.21
4:9–11 33.27
4:11 33.12, 33.21
4:11–13 33.25
4:15 32.37
4:20 31.28
4:20–21 33.26
4:21 31.18
4:22 33.8
4:22–24 33.27
4:25 28.8, 29.10, 33.11
5:1–2 33.18, 33.33
5:2 31.18, 32.39, 33.25, 35.9
5:5 32.39
5:6 29.28, 29.31
5:8 29.8, 29.28
5:8–9 33.11
5:9 29.32, 33.19
5:9–10 31.34
5:10–11 33.6
5:11 33.19, 33.33
5:12 29.Cor1, 30.30
5:13 32.39
5:14 25.21
5:15 33.18
5:15–16 33.12
5:16 33.3
5:17 32.39, 33.18
5:17–18 33.8
5:18–19 29.35
5:19 33.4, 33.21
5:21 29.35
6 40.25
6:3 32.9
6:4 27.22, 28.8
6:7 39.19
6:12 32.16, 35.12
6:14 35.12
6:18 35.14
6:21 32.38
6:22 35.8, 35.42
6:23 33.Ant7, 34.43, 39.20
7:5 35.13
7:7–8 34.30
7:15 32.38
7:16 32.39
7:19 32.20
7:21 32.20
7:22 35.12
7:24 32.49
8:1 32.7, 32.16, 35.11, 39.26
8:2 35.11
8:3 25.5, 25.5n6, 25.18, 34.30
8:3–4 26.8, 29.35, 33.8, 33.20, 35.13
8:4 32.7
8:5 39.10
8:11 28.7
8:14 24.42
8:14 ff. 35.41
8:15 35.7, 36.28
8:16 31.21
8:17 35.43, 40.21
8:17–18 33.Ant7
8:18 34.38, 39.11
8:21 35.44
8:23 35.44
8:26 32.25
8:27 36.5, 36.28
8:28 33.34
8:29 24.12, 24.17, 24.22, 24.26, 24.38, 24.47, 26.51

8:30 24.12, 31.37, 33.3, 33.11, 33.32, 33.34, 33.Ant4
8:32 26.7, 27.18, 29.5
8:33 33.9
8:33–34 33.21, 33.3
8:34 28.32, 36.19
9:3 25.34, 36.50
9:4 40.47
9:11 24.12, 24.33, 24.38, 24.39
9:12–13 24.48
9:15 24.39
9:16 24.35, 24.39, 32.26n29
9:17 24.49n35
9:18 24.39, 24.48, 24.56, 24.57
9:20 24.61
9:21 24.51, 24.53
9:21–22 24.22, 24.48, 24.57
9:22 24.53, 24.56
9:22–23 24.58
9:23 24.43
9:30 33.24, 33.25
9:31 33.15
9:32 33.35
9:33 41.11
10:3 33.15, 33.18
10:3–4 29.35
10:3–6 33.5
10:8 31.11
10:10 31.18
10:13 36.4
10:14 36.5, 36.26
10:15 42.5, 42.9
10:17 31.11, 40.25
10:18 40.26
11 24.33, 33.Ant12
11:2 24.17
11:4 36.36
11:4–5 24.38
11:5 24.39
11:6 33.17
11:7 24.9, 24.17, 24.47, 24.56
11:22 24.61
11:29 31.33
11:33 24.61
11:33–34 24.40
11:35 24.53, 34.41
11:35–36 24.35
11:36 31.28
12:1 42.64
12:1–2 34.16
12:3 24.2n2
12:4–5 41.3
12:7–8 42.27
12:8 37.28, 41.39, 42.59
13:1 35.18, 35.47
13:5 35.18
13:8 34.33
13:8–10 37.4
13:13 37.41
14 37.54
14:5 35.34, 35.42
14:6 37.50
14:9 28.8
14:11 36.36
14:13 35.26n26
14:14 35.33, 35.34
14:15 35.36
14:17 35.42, 37.50
14:19 35.38
14:22 35.36
14:22–23 35.34
14:23 31.27, 32.6, 33.Ant3, 34.21
15:8 26.40
15:20 41.37
16:17 40.42

1 Corinthians

1:2 36.13
1:18 31.12
1:27 24.9
1:30 26.38, 29.35, 33.18, 33.19, 33.21
1:31 33.33
2:2 25.35
2:6 34.33
2:7 24.4
2:8 27.20, 29.6
2:14 30.20
3 41.24
3:5 42.28
3:7 31.12
3:6–7 24.35
3:10–11 42.21
3:11 40.38, 41.11, 41.24, 41.36
3:13 39.8
3:16 40.30
3:21 35.46
3:21–23 41.16

1 Corinthians (*cont.*)
3:23 41.13
4:1 42.28
4:3 24.55
4:3–4 33.36
4:4 33.16, 34.47
4:6 24.2n2
4:15 41.7
5:5 32.52n46, 40.36, 42.Cor4
6:11 33.19, 33.24, 33.9
6:12 35.38
6:19–20 34.16
6:20 29.21
7:2 38.43
7:5 37.45, 37.51
7:21 35.47
7:23 29.21, 35.46
8:5–6 41.8
8:8 37.50
8:13 35.36
9:4 37.25
9:7 37.25
9:14 37.25
9:24 34.46
10 40.25
10:4 41.24
10:13 31.40
10:23 35.36
10:26 37.10
10:31 35.35
10:32 34.17
11:3 41.4, 41.13
11:4 36.35
11:26 40.25
11:32 39.41
12:4 30.11
12:4–6 41.2n3
12:9 31.9
12:12 41.35
12:21 41.35
12:27 41.35
12:28 41.17, 41.39, 42.60
13:2 31.4
13:3 37.15, 37.28
14:15–16 36.31
14:29 ff. 42.22
14:40 42.69
15:10 41.18
15:17 28.8
15:20 28.9
15:21 28.36
15:22 28.8
15:24 41.13
15:24 26.53
15:25 28.27
15:26 26.53
15:27 28.24, 41.10
15:27–28 26.29, 41.13
15:28 26.52
15:3 29.11
15:43 27.31
15:44 28.4
15:45 25.21
15:47 25.21, 25.35, 25.38
15:51–57 40.21
15:57 28.8

2 Corinthians
1:2 36.13
1:8 31.33
1:22 31.21, 35.41, 35.43
2 32.45
2:7 39.52
2:10 39.52
2:15–16 30.46
3 32.11
3:5 30.20
3:8 33.24
3:8–10 32.12
3:17 35.8
4:13 31.9, 33.24
4:18 39.11
5:1 39.12, 40.10
5:8 39.15, 40.18
5:10 28.36, 39.11, 39.16, 24.36
5:17 32.2n3
5:18 24.25, 33.11
5:18–19 35.9
5:19 29.5, 33.10, 33.21
5:21 29.28, 29.32, 33.18, 33.19, 33.21
6:2 39.16
7:10 32.36
7:11 32.28
8 37.29
8:3 37.14
8:9 25.14, 37.6
8:12 37.28

8:12–13 37.15
8:13–14 37.10
9:12 37.37
9:6 37.28
9:7 37.28
9:8–11 37.37
10:17 24.35n27
11:2 41.5, 41.33
11:5 41.18
11:27 37.40
11:28 41.27
12:2 28.13, 28.19n17, 40.15
12:4 28.13, 40.15
13:4 25.34
13:5 31.21
13:13 36.14

Galatians

1:1 41.23
1:2 41.18
1:3 36.13
1:4 29.11
1:16 41.23
2 41.27
2:3–4 35.37
2:6 41.17
2:9 41.17
2:11 35.37, 41.18
2:12 41.25
2:14 35.24
2:16 31.5, 33.15, 33.16, 33.25, 33.35, 33.Ant1n31
2:17 33.19
2:20 29.6, 29.9, 31.26
2:21 33.15
3 40.25
3:8 25.16, 33.6, 33.9
3:10 26.8, 29.28, 35.13
3:11 33.15
3:11–12 33.5
3:13 27.5, 29.14, 29.17, 29.28, 33.20, 35.13
3:13–14 29.32
3:14 29.35, 33.6
3:18 25.16, 29.35
3:21 35.20
3:24–25 37.53n39
4:1 ff. 35.22
4:3 35.22n22
4:4 25.8, 25.19, 25.20, 25.23, 33.13
4:4–5 29.35, 33.20
4:6 35.43
4:6–7 35.41
4:7 35.22
4:8 36.10
4:26 40.23, 40.30
5:1 35.8, 38.37
5:4 33.Ant12
5:5 33.24
5:6 24.36, 33.35
5:11 29.14
5:12 40.39
5:13 35.47
5:14 34.33
5:16 33.29
5:17 35.44, 40.22
5:22 34.5
6:4 39.45
6:7 39.16
6:10 37.24
6:16 40.30

Ephesians

1 25.8
1:4 24.12, 24.15, 24.38
1:4–5 24.22, 24.26
1:5 24.39
1:6 24.43, 35.7
1:7 29.32
1:10 40.14
1:13–14 31.36
1:14 31.21, 35.42, 35.43
1:17 30.10
1:17–18 32.19n17
1:18–19 31.10
1:20–22 28.25
1:22 40.6, 41.3
2 29.32, 41.24
2:1–3 30.17
2:2 35.5n7
2:3 32.20
2:4 33.Ant12
2:6 28.20
2:8 31.5, 33.17
2:9 33.15
2:9–10 33.35
2:10 34.6

Ephesians (*cont.*)
2:12 40.47
2:12 ff. 40.26
2:13 29.14
2:13 ff. 35.23
2:14 35.23
2:17 30.31
2:19 41.6
2:19–21 41.11
2:20 41.37
3:10 36.6
3:12 31.18, 33.26
3:14 36.36
3:17 33.26
4:8 28.17
4:10 28.13
4:11 40.25, 41.17, 41.39, 42.58, 42.59, 42.65
4:11–12 30.10, 42.19
4:11–13 42.20
4:14 42.26
4:14–16 32.14
4:15–16 41.3
4:16 40.30
4:18 30.17
4:22–24 32.13
4:24 32.21
4:28 37.13
4:30 31.36, 35.41
5:2 29.9, 33.11
5:9 34.5
5:20 36.47
5:23 27.23, 41.4
5:24–25 41.5
5:25 29.9
5:25–26 24.28
5:27 39.19n33, 40.30
6:5 35.47
6:12 40.22
6:18 36.45

Philippians
1:1 42.29
1:6 31.33
1:10 34.15
1:23 39.15, 40.18
1:26 33.24
1:29 31.9, 31.10
2 25.5n5, 28.28
2:3 36.43n31
2:5–7 26.49n34
2:6 25.10
2:6–8 26.14
2:7 25.5, 25.14, 25.24
2:7–8 25.8, 27.3
2:8 25.5, 29.7, 29.14, 29.35
2:9 28.29
2:9–11 28.25
2:10 36.13
2:13 31.10, 31.33, 32.23, 32.24n27
2:15 34.18
2:25 42.24
3:8–9 29.35, 33.16
3:9 33.15, 33.18, 33.19, 33.25, 33.27, 33.Ant13
3:9–10 32.9
3:12 31.18
3:14 34.46
3:15 34.33, 40.43
3:20 28.13
3:20–21 28.19
3:21 28.5, 28.12

Colossians
1:3 36.45
1:9 31.17
1:12 35.8
1:12–13 30.7
1:14 29.32
1:15 31.19
1:18 26.51, 41.14, 41.3
1:20 26.3, 26.5, 29.13, 29.32, 36.17, 40.14
1:20–22 29.14
1:21 30.17
1:24 39.50
1:27 35.21
2:7 34.9
2:9 25.39, 25.5, 25.9, 26.19n13
2:10 26.36, 41.14, 41.3
2:12 27.22, 31.9
2:13 31.10
2:14 35.20
2:15 26.31
2:18 36.16n14
2:19 41.3
2:20 38.37
2:22–23 34.13

2:23 37.50
3:1–3 28.20
3:3–4 35.44
3:8–12 32.13
4:2 37.58
4:12 34.33, 36.45

1 Thessalonians
1:9 32.2n3
1:10 31.28
1:12 31.28
2:12 30.10
2:13 31.24
4:3 32.2n3
4:17 39.27
5:6 37.58
5:17 36.42
5:23 25.Ant3n45
5:25 36.45

2 Thessalonians
1:5–6 29.34
1:6–7 34.47
1:8 39.27
1:11 31.10, 33.32
2 40.44, 40.51, 41.30
2:10–11 39.34
2:11 24.56
2:13 24.19, 24.22
2:14 30.15
3:6–13 37.21
3:10–11 37.18

1 Timothy
1:5 31.27, 33.35, 33.Ant8, 37.28
1:7 31.35
2:1 30.31
2:2 36.45
2:3–4 30.31
2:4 30.31n17
2:5 26.33
2:6 29.21, 33.13
2:8 36.36, 36.39
3 41.39, 42.25, 42.69
3:1 42.8
3:2 42.29, 42.65
3:2–12 42.64
3:3 42.60
3:4–5 37.15
3:7 42.35
3:13 42.74
3:16 25.2, 25.5, 25.9
4:1–3 37.49
4:4–5 35.34
4:6 42.28
4:8 37.50
4:14 42.37
4:16 33.10
5:3 37.22
5:8 37.24
5:9 42.63
5:16 37.22, 37.24
5:17 42.8, 42.59, 42.60
5:18 37.25
5:21 24.7, 26.36
5:22 42.33
6:8 37.26
6:17–18 37.6

2 Timothy
1:9 24.12, 24.28, 33.12
1:12 31.21
2:2 42.35
2:19 40.28
2:20 40.35
3:8 24.45
3:15 30.7
3:16 34.42n25
4:8 34.47, 39.13
4:13 31.19n37
4:14 36.51

Titus
1 42.25, 42.69
1:5 42.29
1:7 42.29
1:15 35.35
2:2–3 30.31
2:6 30.31
2:9 30.31
2:11 30.31, 33.11
2:14 29.33, 39.21
3:4 33.11
3:4–5 33.6
3:4–6 32.5
3:5 32.2n3, 32.6, 33.15, 33.35
3:7 31.5, 33.3, 33.32

Titus (*cont.*)
3:8 33.35
3:10 40.42

Hebrews
1:2 28.29
1:3 28.25, 39.25
1:6 36.13
2 28.28
2:4 30.11
2:7–8 28.25, 41.14
2:9 25.40
2:10 26.7, 27.23
2:11–13 30.29
2:12 29.23
2:13 41.7
2:14 25.11, 25.29, 25.40, 28.7
2:15 35.7
2:16 25.5, 25.24, 25.40, 26.35
2:17 25.14, 25.15
3:4 40.4
3:4–6 41.13
3:5–6 41.16
3:6 31.18
3:7 36.14
3:13 32.53
3:14 31.18
4:12 31.12
4:13 36.5
4:14 28.12, 36.15
4:15 25.14, 25.18, 28.4, 36.18, 41.4n4
5 42.7
5:4 36.17, 42.5, 42.6
5:7 36.30
5:8 39.5n11
5:12–14 32.14
5:14 34.33
6:2 41.37
6:6 30.40n21
6:8 24.45
6:10 34.48, 37.4, 37.37
7 28.35
7:3 25.19, 26.44, 26.46
7:9 26.44
7:10:14 26.46
7:14 25.16
7:24–25 26.46
7:25 28.32, 36.18
7:26 25.40, 26.46
8:1 28.25
8:4 35.21
8:5 42.7n5
9 26.43n29, 28.35
9:8 28.20
9:10 35.20
9:12 26.46, 28.15
9:14 25.41, 26.19, 27.21, 29.6, 29.20, 32.9
9:22 33.14
9:23 42.7n5
9:23–24 28.34
9:24 28.15, 36.19, 40.18
9:26 29.32
9:28 29.27, 29.32
10:1 35.21
10:5 29.7
10:7 29.35, 29.7
10:7–8 ff. 26.42
10:10 29.35
10:12 29.11
10:14 32.47
10:19 36.18
10:22 30.38n20
10:23 34.48
10:25 36.40
10:34 37.22
10:36 34.26
11:5 28.12
11:6 32.6, 33.Ant3
11:10 41.37
11:14 35.Cor2n48
11:16 28.13
11:26 34.44, 35.10
12:2 28.25, 29.14, 31.9
12:6 39.41
12:22 26.36, 28.13, 40.6, 40.14
12:24 39.45
13:3 36.45
13:10–11 29.23
13:16 34.42, 38.45
13:18 36.45
13:20 41.9
13:21 32.25

James
1:5–6 36.26
1:6–8 35.34n35

1:9–10 37.6
1:17 34.4, 35.34n35
1:18 32.12
1:25 34.26
2 24.36
2:10–11 37.4
2:14 34.26
2:18 33.36
2:19 31.7
2:21 33.36
2:22 34.9
2:23 33.36
3:2 34.30, 34.33
3:13 37.2
3:17 37.2 note a
4:3 36.23
4:12 33.9, 34.12, 35.17
5:9 36.52
5:14 36.45
5:16 32.46
5:17 25.14n12, 36.17n16
5:20 33.10

1 Peter
1:1 41.17
1:1–2 24.19
1:2 24.12, 29.33
1:4 34.43
1:9 31.28, 34.43
1:18 35.8
1:18–19 29.21, 32.9
1:19 33.14
1:20 24.24
1:23 32.12
2 24.56
2:4 41.11
2:5 40.30
2:8 24.48
2:16 35.14
2:21 39.50
2:24 29.13, 29.27
3:16 34.17n11
3:18 25.34, 26.19, 29.11
4:2 25.34
4:3 32.20
4:7 37.58
4:15 39.14
4:19 37.2n2
5 37.41, 42.25
5:1 41.17, 42.57
5:1–2 42.65
5:1–3 42.29
5:2–4 41.16
5:3 41.9n7, 41.39
5:4 41.9
5:5 36.25
5:10 31.33

2 Peter
1:3 31.10
1:5 34.16
1:7 37.24
1:18 40.15
1:9–10 34.16
2:3 39.35
2:20 30.41

1 John
1:2 25.12
1:7 29.33, 32.47, 33.13, 39.20, 39.21
1:8 34.34, 35.12
1:9 34.48
2:1 28.32, 36.19
2:1–2 28.34
2:2 26.3
2:27 31.36
2:29 33.35
3:7 33.35
3:9 31.33, 34.34
3:10 33.35
3:16 29.29
3:21–22 36.23
4:2 25.5
4:9 26.7
4:9–10 26.6
5:3 34.33
5:4 40.22
5:8 34.34
5:10 31.24
5:16 36.45
5:19 24.21

2 John
1:3 36.13
1:9 40.42
1:10 40.46

3 John
1:9–11 41.39

Jude
1:4 24.48
1:6 24.7, 26.36
1:11 31.37
1:20 41.24

Revelation
1:4 36.14
1:5 29.33, 36.13, 41.10
1:12 28.19n17
2 40.21
2:2 40.36
2:10 39.13
2:14 40.36
3 40.21
3:3 37.58
3:20 30.10
3:21 40.18
4:8 40.18
5:5 36.6
5:8 36.20, 40.18
5:10 40.21
6:10 36.20, 36.51
7:9 24.30, 40.18
7:16 39.15
8:3 28.35
11 40.44, 40.51
12 40.44, 40.51
13:8 24.47, 29.27, 40.31
14:12 34.9
14:13 39.12, 40.10, 40.19
15 40.51
15:3 41.10
16:15 37.58
17 40.44, 40.51
18:23 41.5
19:10 40.6
19:16 41.10
20:6 32.2n3
20:15 24.47
21 41.24
21:7 40.21
21:9 40.30, 41.5
21:14 41.17
21:14–19 41.23
21:22–23 26.52

Wisdom of Salomon
5:3 32:31

Ecclesiasticus / Jesus Son of Sirach
16:13 34.42

1 Maccabees
2:58 40.15

2 Maccabees
12 39.9

General Index

Aagtekerke 159
Aaron 423, 621, 623, 625, 629, 645
abbot 215, 657
Abcoude 443
Abel 547
Abelard, Peter 569
Abels, Paul H.A.M. 621
Abraham 69, 73, 75, 83, 119, 121, 123, 151, 313, 333, 347, 367, 375, 425, 513, 559, 563, 565
absolution 295, 307, 325, 327, 553
absolutus (adj.), *absolute* (adv.), see Glossary 32, 58, 60, 62, 104, 105, 114, 134, 136, 144, 200, 204, 244, 270, 320, 328, 342, 348, 352, 394, 426, 432, 438, 448, 450, 484, 492, 544, 548, 588, 592, 594, 604, 610, 661, 666, 668, 669, 670
abstinence 361, 401, 467, 469, 473, 477, 491, 495
abyss 587
accidens (n.) 59, 190, 227, 250, 352, 386, 464, 474, 490, 661
accident, accidental 14, 59, 73, 192, 225, 251, 353, 387, 465, 475, 551, 613, 661, 666, 670
Acephalites 97
Acheron 505
achōristōs (adj.) 81
Acolytes 657
ad extra, see Glossary 68, 69, 114, 115, 183, 344, 415, 661, 665, 673
ad intra, see Glossary 69, 416, 661, 665, 673
Adam 57, 61, 71, 75, 77, 101, 103, 217, 219, 221, 310, 343, 375, 377, 445, 473, 629
Adam, Gottfried 219
adiairetōs (adj.) 81
administration 13, 57, 127, 597, 601, 603, 607, 663
administration of the Word or sacraments 221, 265, 571, 583, 641, 653
adokimos (adj.) 51
adoption 37, 39, 103, 229, 275, 365, 427
adoration 349, 413
Aegidius 219, 511
Aeneas 525
aequivocus (adj.), see Glossary 488, 661
Aeschylus 503
affection 9, 247, 283, 285, 287, 289, 291, 311, 323, 443, 449, 451
affectus (n.), see Glossary 38, 39, 74, 170, 186, 230, 234, 240, 242, 282, 284, 288, 290, 382, 418, 428, 442, 448, 450, 592, 662
affliction 195, 369, 475, 477, 487, 503, 521, 551
Africa 369, 531
Agabus 631
Agellius 290
Agricola, Johannes 385
Ahab 295
Albala, Ken 474
Albert the Great 535
Alexander the metalworker 441
Alexander VI, pope 474
Alexandria 79, 81, 83, 89, 93, 95, 97, 271, 573
allegorical 169, 527, 569
Almain, Jacques 259
almoners 461
alms, almsgiving 9, 443, 445, 447, 449, 451, 453, 455, 457, 459, 461, 463, 465, 467, 469, 471, 473, 475, 477, 479, 481, 483, 491, 493, 499, 543, 553
altar 6, 101, 147, 465
Altenstaig, Johannes 287, 383, 385
Ambrose 99, 157, 207, 274, 479, 531
Ambrosiaster 410
Ammerstol 67
Amsterdam 181, 209
Amyraut, Moïse 238
Anabaptism 387
Anabaptist 7, 9, 11, 49, 69, 93, 95, 97, 163, 303, 359, 385, 387, 397, 429, 447, 561, 577
analogia (n.), see Glossary 24, 148, 234, 362, 363, 394, 632, 633, 661, 662
analogy of faith 149, 633
angel 11, 25, 57, 63, 103, 109, 117, 119, 125, 127, 131, 135, 165, 173, 191, 309, 387, 415, 417, 419, 421, 423, 513, 535, 559, 561, 565, 567, 595, 615
animal 195, 203, 215, 237, 287, 449, 473, 664, 668
Anselm of Canterbury 183
Antic, Radiša 471
Antichrist, the 13, 127, 177, 577, 583, 587, 589, 611, 615, 617, 619, 643, 645, 647

antichrists 395, 579
Antidicomarianites 421
antilutron (n.) 193, 311
Antinomians, Antinomianism 385
Antioch 93, 601, 609, 651, 653
antiquity 95, 165, 453, 471, 557, 637, 639
Antwerp 529
apocrypha 15, 365, 529, 565
Apollinaris 97, 109, 141
Apollos 45, 635, 643
apostasy 49, 269, 271, 577
apostate 569, 581
apostolic succession 647
Appold, Kenneth G. 241
appropriation 115, 137, 345
Aquileian 147
Aquinas, Thomas 83, 115, 133, 134, 135, 143, 161, 231, 243, 244, 245, 257, 261, 267, 298, 326, 335, 352, 383, 393, 415, 451, 473, 501, 520, 521, 536, 539, 550, 551, 563, 573, 579, 580, 581, 611
Aramaic 603, 605
arbitrium (n.), see Glossary 24, 36, 54, 56, 58, 60, 224, 238, 268, 272, 278, 290, 326, 336, 344, 384, 468, 488, 492, 624, 662, 673
Arethas 531
Arianism 93, 97
Arians 6, 99, 141
Aristotelian 10, 73, 77, 103, 105, 247, 287, 327, 562, 661, 662, 663
Aristotle 95, 215, 237, 245, 249, 261, 287, 375, 405, 447, 449, 459, 661, 664, 665
Arius 93
Arminian 7, 33, 35, 37, 39, 181, 523
Arminians 4, 39
Arminius, Jacobus 2, 3, 31, 37, 45, 57, 119, 203, 219, 223, 269, 271, 359
Armstrong, Brian G. 243
Armstrong, Jonathan J. 367
ascension 6, 15, 97, 121, 159, 163, 165, 167, 169, 171, 177, 563, 631
Asia 217
Asia Minor 93
Asselt, Willem J. van 87, 101, 139, 283, 307, 463, 465, 508, 509, 533
assumption of human nature 79, 91, 115
  of the form of a servant 125
assurance 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 223, 231, 249, 257, 259, 273, 275, 327, 405
Assyrian 509
Athanasian Creed 147, 148
Athanasius 95, 97
Athens 561
atonement 6, 91, 125, 147, 179, 195, 207, 311, 507, 515, 527
attribute 89, 109, 135, 159, 175, 346, 355, 635, 649, 662, 663, 668, 669, 672
Augsburg 93
Augsburg Confession 409
Augustine 4, 15, 23, 24, 25, 27, 39, 49, 61, 95, 105, 115, 143, 147, 151, 160, 161, 206, 207, 217, 231, 233, 237, 255, 263, 274, 275, 277, 289, 290, 291, 294, 302, 303, 337, 338, 339, 345, 346, 347, 351, 352, 353, 355, 363, 369, 391, 409, 410, 411, 415, 469, 479, 481, 507, 509, 521, 526, 527, 529, 547, 561, 573, 579, 581, 617, 637
Augustine of Ancona or Augustinus Triumphus 540, 541
Augustinian 24, 25, 351, 352, 541, 661
Augustinianism 352
Augustus 79
auricular confession 299
autopistos (adj.) 365
Avignon 555
Ayala, Martin Perez de 259

Baambrugge 443
Babylon 437
Babylonian captivity 469
back-sliding 301
Backerius, Johannes, or Johannes Cornelii Backer 343
Backus, Irena 15
Baert, Barbara 591
Balaam 271
Balbianus, Nicolaus 67
Bañez, Domingo 237, 267
baptism 231, 309, 397, 489, 493, 519, 549, 557, 571, 653
Barnabas 75, 631, 633, 643, 653
Barradas, Sebastião, or Sebastianus Barradius 527
Barth, Karl 17, 138
Basil the Great 15
Basirius, Jacobus 309, 315
Bavinck, Herman 153, 175, 419, 574
Beck, Andreas J. 4, 35, 63, 465

Bede or Beda 533
Beeke, Joel 273
beggar, begging 453, 455, 533
Belgic Confession 202, 641
believer 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 41, 51, 111, 147, 197, 202, 221, 223, 231, 235, 253, 255, 259, 263, 265, 269, 271, 273, 275, 277, 281, 289, 301, 305, 313, 323, 325, 327, 351, 367, 369, 377, 379, 381, 385, 387, 405, 407, 409, 417, 423, 431, 433, 435, 441, 447, 449, 451, 457, 467, 469, 485, 489, 493, 501, 503, 509, 511, 513, 541, 549, 551, 557, 563, 565, 571, 573, 575, 579, 587, 593, 605, 609, 611, 641
Bellarmine, Robert 16, 113, 161, 235, 246, 247, 255, 261, 293, 328, 333, 335, 337, 349, 357, 359, 385, 387, 489, 491, 492, 493, 495, 496, 497, 501, 502, 503, 507, 510, 511, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 519, 521, 525, 526, 527, 529, 532, 533, 534, 535, 537, 541, 543, 544, 545, 549, 585, 587, 609, 611, 613, 617, 641, 643, 645
Belt, Henk van den 1, 2, 7, 16, 127, 148, 163, 209, 219, 223, 311, 365, 373, 403, 588
Bennebroek 181
Bergambacht 67
Berkouwer, Gerrit Cornelis 309
Bernard of Clairvaux 134, 137, 215, 339, 341, 369, 371, 377, 411, 531, 613
Berroit-Salvadore, Evelyne 77
Bertius, Petrus 203, 271
Bethlehem 78, 79
Beza, Theodore 3, 27, 37, 62, 63, 205, 219, 571, 605
Bible 3, 14, 15, 17, 63, 113, 289, 432, 527, 531, 605
biblical 10, 14, 19, 199, 251, 359, 437, 493, 509
Bie, Jan Pieter de 209
Biel, Gabriel 259, 267, 383
Biener, Zvi 245
Bigane, John E. 603
Bilson, Thomas 651
Binder, Wilhelm 539
Biscopius, Isaac, or Isaacus Episcopius 23
bishop 13, 95, 97, 141, 245, 251, 301, 391, 451, 503, 505, 531, 535, 537, 545, 551, 577, 585, 609, 615, 625, 635, 641, 645
Bithynia 217
blasphemy, blasphemous 31, 59, 515, 519, 547
blessing 75, 119, 191, 199, 307, 431, 455, 465, 641
blood of martyrs 369, 441
Boer, William den 32, 45, 57, 359
Bonaventure 383, 447
Boniface III, pope 609
Boniface VIII, pope 555
book of life 53, 557
Bos, Frans Lukas 309
Bosschaert, Jacobus 559
Bourges 151
Bouwens, Leonard 303
Brabant, province of 589
Brandt, Gerard 569
bread 161, 445, 453, 457, 473, 487
Brenz, Johannes 97, 167, 175
bride 41, 569, 591, 597, 611, 613
bridegroom 41, 215, 569, 591, 597, 611, 613
Brink, Gert van den 87, 182, 191, 192, 203, 283, 307, 533
Brink, Gijsbert van den 159
brothers 39, 75, 119, 219, 299, 349, 401, 423, 425, 437, 449, 547, 561, 593, 599, 635, 643
Brown, Peter 637
Bucer, Martin 149, 571, 573
Buitendag, Johan 148
Bullinger, Heinrich 539
burial 6, 133, 141, 143, 147, 149, 153, 159
Bynum, Carol Walker 531
Byzantine 455, 609

Caesarea 15, 532
Caiaphas 143
Cain 271
Cajetan or Thomas de Vio 391
calling to minister to the church 14, 19, 597, 601, 607, 621, 625, 627, 629, 631, 637, 643, 645, 647, 649, 655, 659
calling to salvation 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 10, 13, 27, 29, 37, 41, 43, 47, 51, 59, 121, 209, 211, 213, 217, 221, 223, 225, 227, 229, 271, 297, 305, 327, 343, 355, 367, 377, 559, 561
Callistus, Nicephorus 472
Calvin, John 2, 3, 16, 53, 62, 63, 111, 119, 138, 139, 148, 149, 153, 155, 175, 205, 221, 223, 243, 253, 255, 274, 291, 297, 309, 321, 327, 335, 352, 365, 373, 377, 381, 387, 399, 401, 403, 407, 421, 437, 561, 569, 571, 573, 589, 609, 617, 633, 641, 647, 651

Institutes 2, 16, 63, 111, 119, 139, 149, 205, 223, 253, 291, 297, 335, 352, 365, 373, 377, 381, 399, 401, 403, 407, 421, 569, 573, 589, 609, 617, 633, 647, 651, 655
Calvinism 159
Calvinist 89, 159, 169, 309, 398, 461, 503
Cameron, John 8, 229, 237, 238, 285, 573
Cameronian 229, 238
Candelaria, Lorenzo F. 419
canon, canonical 57, 365, 448, 453, 473, 491, 507, 543, 579, 580, 649
Canons of Dort 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 31, 51, 53, 147, 197, 211, 238, 271, 285
Cantimpré, Thomas de 535
capability 61, 233, 439
Capernaum 615
Cappadocia 531
Cappadocian 97
cardinals 649
Carena 553
Carmelite 539
carnal 77, 347, 353, 509
Cassian 89
Cassiodorus 453
Castellio, Sebastian 63
Castro, Alfonso de 529
Casulanus 481
Catechism 6, 16, 99, 111, 119, 133, 135, 149, 155, 163, 165, 171, 263, 521, 623, 626
causa (n.), see Glossary 10, 28, 38, 40, 42, 60, 102, 103, 108, 110, 112, 113, 116, 120, 130, 132, 134, 142, 143, 144, 160, 182, 184, 186, 188, 192, 210, 212, 213, 236, 237, 238, 240, 248, 262, 264, 278, 280, 294, 296, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 316, 332, 336, 342, 344, 346, 354, 358, 378, 458, 464, 528, 552, 644, 650, 662
causality 237, 238, 261, 662, 664
cause 9, 10, 11, 13, 27, 29, 33, 39, 41, 43, 47, 59, 61, 63, 103, 109, 113, 117, 119, 127, 131, 135, 143, 145, 161, 163, 177, 183, 185, 187, 188, 189, 201, 211, 213, 219, 229, 237, 239, 241, 247, 249, 259, 261, 263, 265, 269, 279, 281, 291, 297, 298, 305, 307, 309, 310, 311, 313, 317, 323, 333, 337, 339, 343, 345, 347, 351, 357, 359, 376, 379, 395, 399, 401, 405, 445, 459, 461, 465, 469, 475, 483, 487, 495, 517, 553, 557, 579, 581, 587, 589, 599, 613, 645, 662
efficient 10, 11, 103, 109, 117, 131, 143, 145, 161, 163, 183, 185, 211, 213, 219, 229, 237, 239, 265, 309, 343, 357, 379, 662
final 10, 11, 183, 188, 309, 662
formal 10, 11, 317, 337, 662
impelling 43, 103, 187, 189, 213, 265, 281, 309, 311, 379
initiating 213, 265, 281, 379, 662
instrumental 10, 11, 119, 143, 213, 229, 239, 263, 265, 279, 281, 309, 310, 337, 343, 345, 347, 379, 662
material 10, 11, 309, 313, 317, 662
meritorious 187, 279, 309, 311, 317, 337, 339
non-mediated 333
proximate efficient 131, 143, 145, 185, 333
Celestine V, pope 555
celibacy 12, 493, 495
Celsus 639
censure 361, 651, 657
centurion 141
Cephas 599, 603
ceremonial 10, 11, 333, 377, 381, 387, 388, 389, 391, 393, 395, 407, 469, 485, 491
ceremonies 391, 393, 469, 471, 653
Cerinthus 389, 391
certainty 7, 8, 141, 147, 223, 249, 253, 255, 257, 263, 273, 275, 331, 335, 537, 651, 653, 664
Chalcedon 69, 89, 95, 97
character 12, 25, 99, 140, 192, 259, 285, 291, 317, 327, 397, 649, 657
charity 12, 51, 261, 327, 351, 352, 443, 447, 449, 453, 573
chaste, chastity 331, 339, 469, 489, 495, 523
chastisement 135, 195, 199, 439, 477, 503
Chemnitz, Martin 97, 175, 247, 515
Chimaera 247
Christ as Head of the Church 13, 39, 85, 127, 171, 173, 211, 221, 275, 423, 449, 551, 561, 569, 589, 591, 593, 595, 597, 601, 609, 613, 621
as High Priest 125, 167, 177
as King 41, 85, 119, 127, 173, 195, 569, 593, 603, 611
as Lamb 39, 53, 193, 195, 197, 207, 225, 567, 575, 577, 587, 607
as liberator 379
as Priest 85, 119, 123, 125, 147, 177, 179, 194, 203, 423
as Prophet 85, 119, 163, 177

as Redeemer 39, 183, 185, 209, 229, 311, 317, 551
as surety 117, 135, 161, 183, 193, 315
authority of 165, 185, 589, 595
benefits of 229, 393, 409
betrayal of 133
blood of 35, 41, 89, 91, 103, 113, 127, 135, 139, 145, 157, 188, 189, 191, 199, 203, 207, 299, 301, 311, 315, 337, 339, 379, 389, 503, 517, 547, 571
co-heirs with 365, 405
conception of 77, 79
death of 6, 81, 87, 91, 97, 99, 103, 107, 113, 117, 133, 135, 137, 139, 141, 143, 145, 147, 149, 151, 153, 155, 159, 163, 171, 175, 177, 181, 185, 187, 188, 189, 191, 192, 199, 201, 203, 265, 281, 309, 311, 333, 423, 547, 563, 571, 631
disciples of 23, 107, 161, 163, 165, 167, 171, 289, 349, 413, 431, 435, 565, 601, 603, 615, 617, 633, 643
divinity of 87, 111, 113, 115, 117, 127, 149, 163, 301, 391, 580
exaltation of 5, 6, 73, 133, 159, 161, 171, 175
family of 561, 591, 593
humiliation of 5, 6, 73, 131, 133, 135, 147, 153, 155, 159
(hypostatic) union of 3, 6, 67, 79, 81, 83, 91, 93, 97, 99, 135, 139, 165, 175, 419
image of 37
imitation of 471
office of 5, 6, 83, 91, 101, 103, 109, 111, 113, 117, 119, 123, 127, 129, 131, 133, 159, 163, 177, 181, 185, 189, 203, 229, 409, 410, 423, 499, 569, 579, 595
participation with 9, 337
passion of 7, 97, 133, 137, 139, 143, 145, 147, 171, 175, 189, 551, 563
union with 551, 591, 595, 597
will of 107, 145, 163, 177
wonders of 121
work of 1, 41, 85, 91, 103, 105, 109, 113, 115, 119, 121, 125, 131, 157, 185, 201, 315, 331
wounds of 163, 189, 197, 199
Christendom 463
Christianity 97, 298, 301, 375, 409, 493, 495, 531
Christians 6, 12, 13, 93, 95, 333, 339, 352, 385, 387, 391, 393, 395, 397, 405, 409, 447, 463, 479, 491, 537, 549, 559, 585, 609, 627
Christmas 471
Christological 89, 93, 271, 410
Christology 2, 3, 5, 6, 63, 95, 145, 185, 666
Chrysostom, John 527, 531
Church, authority of the 259, 505, 539, 551, 611
catholic 4, 505, 573, 585, 605, 613, 631
Eastern 137, 147, 471
governance of the 13, 577, 597, 635
invisible 13, 570, 573, 574, 577, 583, 597, 613
marks of the 13, 389, 561, 571, 573, 579, 583, 585, 587, 589, 641
militant 423, 561, 567, 569, 571
Reformed 1, 5, 39, 43, 297, 463, 465, 639, 641, 643, 649
Roman Catholic 151, 245, 271, 352, 473, 589, 597, 641, 645, 647
visible 13, 225, 569, 573, 577, 579, 583, 597, 613
Western 471, 573
of England 505
church fathers 12, 14, 15, 17, 69, 71, 97, 98, 137, 138, 141, 147, 327, 369, 371, 391, 435, 445, 501, 503, 529, 531, 537, 553, 565, 647, 664
Church Order of Dort 643, 657
Cicero 263, 323, 355, 409, 515, 525
Cilicia 301
cilicium (n.) 301, 431, 475
circumcision 121, 277, 287, 391, 393, 401, 489, 599
Cistercian 215
Clancy, Patrick Michael J. 471
Claudianus, Claudius 524
cleansing 263, 377, 465, 479
Cledonius 83
Clement VI, pope 139
Clement VIII, pope 555
Clement of Alexandria 573
Clement of Rome 139, 531, 555
clerics, clerical 471, 537, 649, 657
Cocceians 101
Cocceius, Johannes 101
coffers, ecclesiastical 635, 653
Cohn, Norman 397
Coimbra 527
Colijnsplaat 277
Collins, Roger 533
Colloquium at Durlach 507

Colloquy of Montbéliard 63, 219
Collyridians 421
Colossae 579
Comestor, Peter 561
comfort 113, 135, 297, 409, 561
commandment 11, 12, 123, 261, 331, 359, 361, 383, 395, 417, 425, 435, 443, 451, 491, 543
commands 145, 331, 347, 361, 391, 405, 435, 493, 497
communicabilis (adj.), see Glossary 592, 663
communicable 663, 666
communicatio idiomatum (n.) 85, 88, 89, 109, 144
communion 9, 13, 83, 91, 185, 211, 219, 225, 301, 303, 495, 549, 569, 571, 575, 577, 579, 581, 591, 595, 597
communis (adj.), see Glossary 24, 26, 54, 56, 58, 60, 68, 70, 74, 84, 106, 108, 112, 114, 116, 126, 172, 188, 208, 212, 216, 218, 220, 224, 232, 234, 240, 244, 256, 286, 334, 350, 380, 384, 386, 394, 398, 406, 414, 422, 428, 434, 438, 444, 448, 460, 466, 468, 476, 484, 488, 524, 566, 598, 600, 606, 612, 628, 632, 636, 640, 642, 658
community 447, 495, 577
concupiscence 357, 517, 541
concurrence 81, 223, 225
condemnation 11, 35, 37, 133, 279, 281, 307, 375, 377, 381, 405, 409, 523
condition, condional 10, 31, 43, 59, 63, 239, 269, 295, 357, 395, 439, 485, 493, 495, 497, 523, 662
confession 299, 513, 525, 543, 575, 581, 603, 605
confidence 7, 67, 223, 235, 241, 243, 245, 247, 249, 251, 253, 255, 425, 427, 497, 619
congregation 219, 301, 421, 491, 637, 639
Conon of Tarsus 95
conscience 10, 11, 111, 177, 255, 261, 281, 295, 301, 313, 315, 323, 339, 355, 373, 377, 381, 385, 387, 399, 401, 403, 405, 407, 409, 437, 447, 467, 471, 473, 475, 479, 541, 543, 593, 605, 611, 657
consistory 271, 433, 637, 639, 651, 657
Constantine 93, 531
Constantinople 83, 97, 271, 435, 453, 471, 473, 609
contingency 31, 183, 415, 661, 662, 663, 667
Coolhaes, Caspar 569
Coornhert, Dirck Volckertsz 570
Corinth 579
correspondence 87, 259
corruption 7, 55, 57, 121, 211, 225, 287, 343, 355, 377, 407, 633, 664
Council of Basel 635
Council of Carthage 369, 641
Council of Chalcedon 69, 95, 97
Council of Constantinople, First 83, 97
Council of Constantinople, Second 83
Council of Ephesus 83, 435
Council of Florence 531, 562, 609
Council of Lyons 611
Council of Nicaea 93
Council of Orange 24, 57
Council of Trent 149, 161, 241, 251, 257, 279, 295, 298, 299, 309, 326, 327, 328, 329, 335, 352, 491, 501, 503, 505, 529, 573
councils 1, 241, 501, 529, 539, 635
covenant 3, 67, 101, 121, 123, 243, 369, 427, 489, 571, 585, 629
creation 1, 3, 4, 27, 37, 161, 277, 289, 445, 662, 667
creator 193, 209, 445, 497, 667
creature 173, 214, 217, 347, 349, 387, 407, 449, 485, 497, 559
Creed, Apostles' 71, 133, 139, 147, 148, 151, 189, 581, 585
  Athanasian 147, 148
  Nicean 71, 133, 139, 147, 148, 151, 189, 581, 585
crime 611, 421, 479, 529
criminal 543
cross 6, 18, 93, 101, 103, 107, 111, 117, 133, 135, 145, 147, 151, 159, 163, 171, 177, 189, 195, 197, 361, 429, 431, 437, 455, 511, 533
crucified 85, 89, 143, 145, 157, 185, 279, 565
crucifixion 6, 133
Curia, the 657
curse 10, 131, 133, 137, 183, 189, 191, 193, 197, 253, 307, 377, 383, 407, 439, 441, 455, 517
Cusa, Nicholas of 634, 635
Cyprian 15, 301, 353, 355, 521, 569, 577, 637, 639, 643
Cyrenaean 643
Cyrene 631
Cyril of Alexandria 79, 89, 161, 271
Cyril of Jerusalem 521

damnation 53, 55, 131, 137, 193, 273, 501, 533, 557
Danzig 241
Dardanus 161
David 14, 31, 75, 79, 87, 89, 137, 289, 297, 301, 313, 333, 393, 413, 417, 419, 425, 427, 431, 437, 479, 485, 487, 521, 541, 567, 569, 659
Davis, Kenneth Ronald 359
deacon 93, 461, 509, 629, 631, 635, 639, 641, 653, 655, 657
deaconess 653
death 2, 6, 73, 81, 87, 91, 97, 99, 103, 105, 107, 113, 117, 129, 133, 135, 137, 139, 141, 143, 145, 147, 149, 151, 153, 155, 159, 163, 169, 171, 175, 177, 181, 183, 185, 187, 188, 189, 191, 192, 199, 201, 203, 205, 207, 209, 213, 227, 245, 265, 281, 293, 295, 307, 309, 311, 333, 361, 373, 375, 377, 381, 383, 391, 407, 417, 423, 437, 501, 507, 511, 513, 515, 517, 521, 531, 541, 547, 555, 561, 562, 563, 571, 631, 647
debtor 181, 207, 315, 425, 515
Decalogue 385, 412, 485, 493
Decius 301
decree 3, 4, 5, 25, 27, 31, 32, 33, 35, 37, 39, 43, 45, 47, 55, 63, 71, 101, 103, 105, 107, 143, 175, 183, 201, 205, 209, 241, 251, 273, 311, 323, 329
deity 71, 93, 115, 193, 567
Delfshaven 483
Delft 305, 461
Deliën, Nicolaas Anthony van der, or Nicolaus Antonius Delienus 413
Demetrius 521
demon 173, 235, 477, 505
DeRidder, Richard R. 437, 643
despair 137, 191, 207, 295, 301, 399, 445
Deursen, Arie Theodorus van 431, 433
devil, see also Satan 10, 149, 207, 377, 381, 405, 409, 509, 533, 535, 569, 595
diaconate 461, 655
Didache 471
Dieterich, Conrad 81
Dillingen 505
Diocletian 531
Diotrephes 615
direct act of the mind 273
Dirk Philips 95, 303
disciples 23, 107, 161, 163, 165, 167, 171, 289, 349, 413, 431, 435, 565, 601, 603, 615, 617, 633, 643
discipline, church discipline 1, 13, 435, 571, 573, 577, 579, 583, 605, 633, 639, 641, 651
dispensation 71, 115, 117, 129, 133, 141, 387, 553, 663
disposition 9, 39, 83, 231, 235, 243, 245, 247, 257, 261, 265, 267, 265, 277, 279, 293, 297, 331, 425, 433, 469, 553, 665
Dissius, Jacobus, or Jacobus Arnoldi Ditsius 305
divine 3, 8, 12, 13, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41, 43, 45, 47, 49, 51, 53, 55, 57, 59, 61, 63, 65, 67, 69, 71, 75, 77, 81, 85, 87, 89, 91, 93, 97, 99, 103, 107, 109, 111, 113, 115, 117, 119, 121, 125, 129, 135, 141, 143, 145, 163, 165, 169, 173, 175, 181, 183, 185, 197, 201, 205, 221, 229, 233, 235, 237, 238, 239, 243, 249, 257, 267, 273, 327, 335, 343, 345, 349, 352, 355, 367, 377, 387, 398, 407, 413, 415, 419, 437, 443, 445, 451, 469, 485, 515, 517, 553, 595, 611, 635, 637, 645, 661, 665, 666, 668
Dominican 153, 237, 245, 267, 327, 505, 531, 535, 553, 557
Donatist 337, 369, 573, 577
Dordrecht 443, 461
doubt 31, 141, 151, 157, 169, 205, 223, 239, 249, 253, 255, 257, 273, 399, 427, 507, 519, 529, 533, 547, 563, 585, 607, 627
Douie, Decima 531
dreams 171, 533
Drobner, Hubert R. 435
Dryhthelm 533
Dublin 558
Durand of St. Pourçain 149, 151, 153, 243, 245, 259, 545, 569
Dutch Republic 1

Easter 471, 479
Ebion 391
Ebionites 391
ecclesial canons 553
ecclesiology 1, 13, 15, 570
economical Trinity 663
economy 67, 69, 71, 133, 173, 179, 309, 595, 663
ecumenical Council 93, 97
Eden, Trudy 474
Edessa 509
effectiveness 261, 337

efficaciter (adv.) 122, 124, 130, 172, 286, 548, 560, 574, 588, 620
efficacy, efficacious 6, 7, 9, 13, 25, 31, 69, 77, 83, 109, 113, 147, 149, 151, 153, 177, 197, 223, 237, 241, 265, 291, 345, 357, 423, 475, 519, 585, 587, 595
Egmond 101
Egypt 81, 95, 207, 391
Egyptians 367
elders 625, 631, 635, 637, 639, 641, 645, 649, 651, 653, 655, 657, 659
elect 6, 7, 13, 25, 27, 29, 33, 37, 39, 41, 43, 47, 49, 51, 53, 57, 59, 61, 69, 91, 119, 127, 129, 197, 225, 229, 233, 243, 267, 269, 273, 311, 323, 550, 551, 561, 573, 575, 583
election 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41, 43, 45, 47, 49, 51, 53, 55, 59, 119, 147, 209, 243, 265, 269, 271, 273, 343, 349, 637, 639, 641, 655, 657
eleēmosynē (n.) 443
elenctic disputation 12, 16, 499
Eli 75
Elijah 15, 75, 165, 171, 469, 565, 645
Emmanuel 81, 103
emotion, emotional 73, 137, 533
emperor 93, 301, 397, 445, 455, 531, 609
enanthrōposis (n.) 69
England 385
enlightenment, divine 239
Enoch 165, 171
enthusiasm 49
Epaphroditus 633
Ephesus 635
Ephraem the Syrian 509, 510
Epiphanius of Salamis 389, 391, 421
Epirus 505
Eraclius or Eradius 637
Erasmus, Desiderius 182
Esau 53
essentia (n.), *essentialis* (adj.), see Glossary 66, 72, 80, 90, 94, 114, 115, 160, 268, 282, 572, 576, 582, 612, 663, 664, 666, 668, 672
essential 73, 81, 91, 115, 125, 137, 161, 192, 205, 227, 283, 293, 343, 355, 375, 467, 573, 577, 613, 661, 662, 663, 664, 666, 668
Estep, William R. 397
Estha 75
eternal death 129, 137, 183, 191, 192, 307
  life 45, 47, 61, 91, 183, 203, 211, 217, 253, 267, 285, 315, 317, 319, 321, 323, 327, 357, 365, 409, 477
  punishment 192, 501, 517, 519, 531
eternity 27, 33, 35, 37, 51, 55, 73, 91, 117, 129, 137, 143, 163, 173, 192, 265, 355, 509
Ethiopian 393, 587
etymology, etymological 13, 249, 377, 483
Eucharist 89, 395
eucharistia (n.) 125, 497
Euchites 435
eudaimonia (n.) 215
eudokia (n.) 47
Europe 567
Eusebius of Caesarea 119, 470, 471
Eutyches 89, 96, 97
evangelical counsels 331, 345, 361
Eve 71, 310
everlasting punishment 187, 192, 355
evidentia (n.), see Glossary 46, 248, 476, 594, 664
evil 10, 37, 39, 45, 47, 57, 95, 113, 143, 179, 211, 225, 287, 293, 295, 346, 347, 355, 369, 379, 401, 405, 407, 413, 423, 425, 439, 443, 471, 475, 479, 495, 509, 547, 567, 589, 591, 651
Évora 527
excommunication 303, 505, 557, 605
execution of God's decree 27, 33, 209
exegesis, exegetical 7, 14, 15, 93, 249, 271, 509, 527, 603, 625
expiatio (n.) 101, 146, 194
expiation 103, 155, 195, 517

fables 525, 533
Fabricius, Gaius 354, 355
facultas (n.), see Glossary 60, 80, 282, 284, 288, 442, 450, 454, 456, 458, 494, 661, 664, 669
faculties of the human soul 9, 81, 283, 285, 289, 456, 662, 664, 668
faith, historical 8, 231, 233, 235, 237
  hope, and love 191, 263, 265, 333, 435
  justifying 7, 8, 147, 211, 233, 235, 237, 239, 243, 245, 259, 261, 263, 265, 269, 343, 349, 353
  living 7, 11, 31, 223, 275, 321, 379
  marks of 349, 357
  reflexive act of 273

saving 7, 8, 45, 223, 229, 233, 235, 247, 263, 273, 297, 319, 373
in God 317, 459
in Christ, in Jesus 31, 199, 211, 217, 281, 285, 299, 307, 317, 319, 347, 459, 479
in miracles 8, 233, 235, 237
fall of Adam 4, 35, 37, 57, 75, 101, 131, 307, 343, 375, 445, 448
fasting 9, 11, 12, 15, 301, 349, 437, 443, 467, 469, 471, 473, 475, 477, 479, 481, 483, 493, 499, 543
feelings of the soul 75, 131, 191, 223, 231, 243, 291, 295, 383, 399, 407, 423, 429, 443, 591, 593
fellowship 13, 83, 117, 207, 281, 457, 561, 575, 577, 599
finis (n.), see Glossary 24, 28, 34, 36, 38, 50, 60, 68, 90, 92, 98, 122, 146, 150, 162, 164, 180, 196, 198, 224, 227, 228, 236, 260, 274, 302, 322, 348, 350, 352, 364, 396, 404, 474, 476, 496, 520, 546, 558, 570, 636, 658, 662, 664
fire of purgatory and hell 13, 417, 501, 503, 507, 511, 513, 515, 519, 525, 529, 535, 537
Fisher, John 505, 536
Flavin, Melchior de 539
Flemings, Anabaptist party 303
flesh 6, 12, 67, 69, 71, 73, 75, 77, 79, 83, 87, 89, 93, 96, 99, 103, 107, 115, 117, 119, 123, 125, 157, 161, 171, 189, 205, 207, 215, 219, 221, 271, 281, 285, 287, 329, 357, 359, 381, 383, 387, 407, 409, 475, 479, 487, 551, 569, 581, 591
Fockema Andreae, Sybrandus Johannes 209
forgiveness 8, 47, 125, 201, 235, 253, 255, 257, 281, 295, 297, 299, 311, 319, 321, 329, 331, 339, 355, 357, 425, 465, 501, 507, 513, 515, 517, 521, 535, 547, 549, 555, 557
form 10, 11, 13, 57, 69, 73, 99, 107, 125, 133, 141, 145, 165, 181, 193, 195, 205, 225, 229, 249, 259, 261, 263, 283, 293, 309, 315, 329, 337, 343, 349, 353, 405, 425, 429, 431, 433, 463, 483, 497, 545, 561, 573, 577, 662, 663, 666, 668
forma (n.) 68, 72, 98, 102, 106, 118, 132, 140, 144, 164, 178, 192, 194, 204, 224, 258, 260, 262, 282, 283, 292, 314, 328, 336, 348, 404, 424, 428, 430, 482, 494, 496, 560, 572, 576
Formula of Concord 83, 111, 219, 398
Fornerod, Nicolas 36, 63
France 131, 229, 271, 373, 503, 505, 641
Francis, Duke of Lorraine 507
Franciscan 29, 93, 259, 327, 447, 448, 529, 531, 553
Franeker 209, 431
Frankenthal 93
free choice 37, 41, 55, 57, 59, 61, 199, 215, 239, 269, 291, 337, 345, 376, 385, 411, 415, 489
free grace 4, 29, 63
free will 3, 5, 23, 45, 57, 201, 203, 267, 673
freedom 11, 12, 45, 57, 107, 131, 199, 207, 213, 219, 373, 375, 376, 377, 379, 381, 383, 385, 387, 389, 391, 393, 395, 397, 399, 401, 403, 405, 407, 409, 411, 423, 433, 479, 493
from sin 379, 381, 411
of glory 11, 377, 407, 411
of grace 377, 405, 411
of nature 411
Fresne, Adrienne de 505
Friedberg, Aemilius 579, 634
Frisians, Anabaptist party 303
Fulgentius of Ruspe 25
fundamentum (n.), see Glossary 30, 38, 40, 42, 46, 48, 66, 154, 174, 248, 274, 314, 316, 360, 498, 502, 514, 516, 532, 536, 540, 544, 548, 556, 574, 578, 580, 594, 596, 598, 604, 608, 612, 614, 616, 630, 664
future 4, 12, 25, 27, 35, 41, 43, 45, 75, 127, 139, 163, 171, 265, 275, 303, 355, 363, 377, 397, 415, 437, 439, 483, 521, 563, 655, 659, 661

Galatia 579
Galatians 609
Galen of Pergamon 77
Gandia 527
Gaul 25
Gazophylacium, the sacred treasury 461
Gedeliah 469
Gehenna 511
Geldorpius or Henricus of Geldorp 209
Gellius, Aulus 291
Geneva 3, 63, 131
Genoa 24
Gent 251
gentiles 99, 145, 217, 279, 343, 351, 353, 377, 401, 417, 429, 439, 457, 479, 515, 571, 595, 599, 617, 633, 643, 647
genus (n.) 24, 25, 34, 36, 74, 88, 104, 114, 142, 212, 220, 221, 245, 464, 526, 532, 620, 648, 664, 672
Georgetown 451

Gerhard, Johann 16, 81, 115, 290, 294, 499, 508, 509, 511, 513, 521, 525, 585
Germany 267, 635, 641
Gerson, Jean 383
Gethsemane 133
Giessen 175
glorification 167, 171, 177, 355
gnostic 95, 391
Goclenius, Rudolph 316
God, the Father 6, 9, 31, 33, 37, 39, 47, 69, 71, 85, 91, 93, 101, 103, 107, 109, 113, 115, 117, 119, 125, 127, 129, 133, 135, 139, 141, 143, 145, 147, 159, 161, 163, 165, 167, 171, 173, 175, 177, 179, 183, 185, 187, 191, 193, 197, 211, 219, 229, 237, 259, 301, 309, 325, 345, 361, 367, 379, 407, 413, 415, 419, 423, 425, 427, 431, 433, 435, 439, 441, 449, 495, 513, 557, 567, 569, 585, 595, 597, 609, 664, 670, 672, 673
essence of 67, 75, 81, 95, 115, 117, 161, 201, 345, 415, 419
existence of 71, 73, 79, 113, 499, 503
foreknowledge of 25, 29, 31, 33, 55, 57
gift of 5, 43, 45, 83, 109, 121, 123, 125, 127, 173, 181, 197, 211, 225, 233, 235, 237, 239, 265, 267, 269, 271, 273, 279, 285, 289, 311, 317, 331, 333, 343, 357, 361, 363, 365, 399, 401, 407, 431, 449, 453, 465, 487, 495, 589, 613, 623, 629, 631, 643, 645, 657
glory of 10, 12, 51, 89, 91, 103, 107, 125, 129, 145, 155, 169, 173, 175, 185, 209, 229, 261, 265, 271, 275, 307, 309, 323, 343, 351, 355, 361, 363, 401, 407, 423, 425, 437, 439, 441, 459, 477, 483, 497, 513, 557, 559, 561, 565, 589
good pleasure of 5, 39, 47, 71, 103, 147, 183, 213, 217, 225, 465
goodness of 39, 187, 199, 251, 399, 668
image of 3, 4, 37, 559
work of 9, 25, 69, 71, 115, 237, 345, 419
God-and-man 6, 69, 81, 85, 109, 113, 117, 173, 183, 185, 311, 589, 595
Godhead 69, 73, 91, 109, 115, 117, 135
godly grief 295, 299
Gomarus, Franciscus 2, 3, 4, 35, 37
good work 9, 10, 43, 45, 139, 201, 263, 267, 283, 321, 323, 325, 329, 337, 343, 345, 346, 347, 349, 351, 353, 355, 357, 359, 361, 363, 365, 367, 369, 371, 373, 383, 385, 477, 493, 535, 543, 549, 575
goods 12, 235, 439, 443, 445, 447, 449, 451, 459, 465, 495, 501, 549, 569, 621
Gootjes, Albert J. 229, 238
Gorgias 507, 525
Gorinchem 589
Gospel 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 16, 55, 57, 67, 111, 113, 121, 147, 151, 155, 165, 167, 191, 211, 213, 215, 217, 221, 223, 227, 233, 235, 239, 241, 249, 251, 253, 255, 259, 265, 271, 277, 279, 281, 283, 285, 297, 301, 307, 309, 317, 319, 325, 331, 333, 347, 349, 361, 365, 369, 373, 379, 389, 391, 393, 409, 445, 455, 481, 491, 493, 497, 525, 527, 551, 557, 599, 605, 609, 625, 627, 629, 631, 633, 635, 643, 645, 649, 653
Gouda 67, 181, 461
Goudriaan, Aza 49, 139
government 1, 57, 127, 387, 389, 395, 403, 437, 579, 599, 621, 631, 635, 651
grace 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 19, 23, 29, 31, 35, 37, 41, 43, 45, 47, 49, 53, 55, 57, 59, 61, 63, 79, 83, 101, 103, 109, 117, 119, 125, 127, 129, 147, 177, 181, 185, 199, 207, 209, 213, 219, 221, 223, 225, 233, 237, 239, 243, 253, 255, 257, 259, 261, 263, 265, 267, 269, 273, 275, 279, 285, 289, 291, 295, 299, 303, 307, 309, 311, 313, 315, 317, 319, 321, 323, 325, 326, 327, 333, 335, 337, 345, 351, 361, 365, 369, 377, 379, 381, 405, 411, 421, 423, 425, 427, 489, 501, 503, 517, 541, 553, 559, 561, 571, 597, 635, 665
gratia (n.), see Glossary 23, 24, 30, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44, 46, 48, 52, 54, 56, 58, 60, 78, 82, 100, 102, 105, 116, 118, 124, 126, 128, 146, 176, 184, 196, 198, 206, 208, 212, 214, 216, 218, 220, 222, 224, 232, 234, 236, 237, 238, 242, 244, 246, 252, 254, 256, 257, 258, 260, 264, 266, 268, 272, 274, 278, 284, 288, 289, 290, 298, 302, 306, 310, 312, 314, 316, 318, 320, 322, 324, 326, 332, 336, 344, 345, 360, 362, 364, 376, 378, 380, 404, 410, 420, 422, 424, 426, 438, 488, 502, 516, 538, 540, 552, 558, 560, 570, 596, 600, 634, 665
Gratian 298, 579, 635
gratitude 49, 125, 413, 439, 497, 499
Greece 375, 447
Greek language 25, 27, 51, 63, 69, 75, 79, 89, 125, 149, 171, 181, 195, 215, 223, 247, 253, 293, 301, 311, 351, 365, 405, 423, 425, 447, 483, 503, 505, 559, 561, 587, 591, 623, 649, 666, 668, 671, 672

Greeks 37, 69, 379, 529, 537, 587, 609
Gregory of Elvira 98
Gregory of Nazianzus 83
Gregory of Rimini 245, 352
Gregory of Valencia 16, 266, 267, 500, 501, 506, 507, 513, 514, 515, 518, 523, 537, 538, 539, 550
Gregory the Great, pope Gregory I 95, 298, 609, 618, 619
Gregory X, pope 611
grief 15, 135, 187, 189, 191, 195, 293, 295, 299, 301, 475, 477, 555, 607
Grillmeier, Aloys 95
Grotius, Hugo 203
Gründler, Otto 243
guilt 11, 101, 103, 117, 131, 145, 195, 197, 201, 207, 219, 281, 295, 307, 315, 325, 326, 329, 375, 377, 381, 501, 513, 515, 517, 519, 521, 523, 539, 541, 543, 545

Haag, Émile 229
Haag, Eugène 229
Haak, Theodore 432
habit 9, 243, 319, 329, 333, 337, 477, 479
habitus (n.), see Glossary 9, 230, 234, 242, 244, 246, 260, 264, 276, 288, 297, 318, 328, 332, 336, 665
hades (n.) 149
Haga, Joar 167, 175
Hannah 487
happiness 135, 187, 215, 216, 217, 223, 275, 355, 559, 563, 567, 667
hardship 195, 263, 275, 323, 439, 583
Harrill, J. Albert 375
hatred of sin 201, 295, 297
hearer 231, 349, 429, 431, 643
heart 3, 9, 59, 107, 109, 119, 121, 139, 171, 209, 211, 215, 217, 223, 225, 227, 235, 237, 239, 241, 243, 249, 255, 257, 259, 261, 263, 275, 277, 285, 287, 289, 291, 293, 295, 297, 299, 313, 321, 325, 326, 339, 345, 347, 349, 353, 357, 359, 373, 377, 383, 399, 401, 405, 407, 413, 415, 417, 425, 427, 429, 435, 437, 451, 459, 461, 463, 465, 475, 477, 479, 485, 487, 497, 511, 527, 537, 563, 575, 593, 615, 621, 651, 665
heathen 133, 303, 483, 579, 585, 587
heaven 15, 75, 77, 89, 91, 95, 96, 97, 113, 121, 125, 127, 151, 155, 159, 161, 163, 165, 167, 169, 171, 173, 175, 177, 179, 195, 215, 243, 259, 273, 357, 365, 367, 369, 413, 417, 421, 423, 425, 427, 431, 435, 441, 465, 501, 509, 511, 513, 515, 517, 525, 533, 535, 543, 561, 563, 565, 567, 569, 601, 605, 631, 633, 653, 659
Hebrew 187, 195, 243, 293, 305, 319, 391, 463, 483, 523, 559, 567
Heemstede 181
Heidelberg Catechism 119, 155, 163, 165, 171
hell 6, 103, 113, 133, 135, 137, 139, 147, 148, 149, 151, 153, 155, 159, 169, 177, 189, 191, 439, 501, 503, 511, 515, 517, 527, 533, 535, 547, 557, 563, 575, 583, 601, 605
Henderson, Robert W. 633
Henninger, Mark G. 316
Henricus, Jacobus, or Jacques Henri 373
Henricus, Petrus, or Pierre Henri 373
Heppe, Heinrich 109, 115, 517
Herdt, Jennifer 352
heresy 43, 89, 93, 95, 141, 421, 529, 579
heretic, heretical 5, 13, 93, 163, 255, 435, 529, 561, 579, 580, 581, 585, 587, 633
Herodotus 503
's-Hertogenbosch 413, 621
Heyd, David 331
Heyd, Michael 49
Heyden, Gasper van der 93
Hezekiah 433
hierarchy, Roman Catholic 589, 657
high priest 123, 423, 613, 623, 625
  the pope as 609, 611, 617
Hilary of Poitiers 79
hilastērion (n.) 103, 311
Hoek, Jan 511
Hoenderdaal, Gerrit J. 32
Hoffmann, Melchior 96
holiness 13, 47, 69, 91, 125, 199, 201, 203, 283, 287, 405, 451, 573, 575
Holland 101, 305, 625
Homer, *Iliad* 246
Honders, Huibert Jacob 131
Hoornbeeck, Johannes 465
hope 5, 12, 49, 137, 171, 191, 207, 235, 263, 265, 271, 275, 295, 297, 323, 333, 335, 339, 377, 383, 389, 407, 435, 443, 459, 487, 511
horror of everlasting death 135
Hosea 175, 643
Hosius, Stanislaus 328, 337, 585
hospitality 457, 495

household of faith 127, 457, 593, 639
Huber, Samuel 219
human nature 14, 73, 77, 79, 81, 83, 85, 87, 89, 91, 97, 103, 109, 113, 115, 117, 125, 139, 145, 161, 165, 175, 185, 213, 217
traditions 11, 377, 381, 385, 407, 505, 645
humanity, humankind 1, 83, 113, 139, 141, 175, 181, 217, 283, 311, 377, 663, 665
humans 133, 188, 323, 375, 376
humility 5, 11, 12, 49, 133, 135, 155, 177, 301, 349, 425, 445
hupostasis (n.), see Glossary 79, 80, 81, 193
Hus, Jan 573
Hymenaeus 271
hypocrites 59, 225, 415, 435, 445, 575, 577, 579
hypostatic union 6, 79, 91, 93, 97, 99, 139, 175, 419

iconoclasm 473
identification 265, 285, 291
idolatry, idolatrous 389, 417, 569, 643
ignorance 247, 541
illness 189, 303, 541, 647
illumination 289
illustration 10, 401, 423
Illyricus, Matthias Flacius 397
images 495
imagination 151
immediate (adv.), see Glossary 74, 76, 120, 126, 188, 236, 256, 258, 286, 384, 386, 596, 628, 630, 632, 642, 646, 648, 665
immorality 495
immortality, immortal 125, 169, 205, 207, 283, 355, 407, 559, 561
immutabilitas (n.), see Glossary 30, 106, 665
immutability, immutable 5, 29, 31, 107, 559, 665, 667
impassibility 135
imperfection, imperfect 35, 141, 283, 295, 323, 357, 361, 385, 521
impious, impiously 351, 353, 369, 439, 525
improprie (adv.), see Glossary 324, 326, 330, 466, 592, 665, 670
impulsiva (adj.), *impulsive* (adv.) 186, 213, 310, 662
impurity, impure 353, 579, 583, 645
imputation 9, 111, 182, 195, 203, 263, 307, 309, 315, 316, 317, 321, 323, 326, 335, 337, 352, 551
in se, see Glossary 44, 46, 50, 118, 120, 130, 134, 152, 154, 156, 188, 196, 232, 250, 256, 267, 272, 274, 286, 312, 322, 326, 328, 334, 376, 378, 394, 400, 426, 430, 666, 671
incarnate 71, 93, 95, 185
incarnation 3, 5, 6, 14, 17, 67, 69, 71, 79, 91, 95, 97, 99, 115, 157, 175, 181
income 453, 537
incorporeal 73
independence 375, 672
India 393, 566, 567
indulgence 9, 12, 13, 16, 303, 331, 499, 523, 537, 539, 541, 543, 545, 549, 551, 553, 555, 557
inequality 443, 445, 649
inexcusableness 227
infallibility, infallible 33, 51, 107, 257, 259, 499, 575, 611
infancy, infant, infants 243, 431, 455, 389, 501, 557
infinitas (n.), *infinitus* (adj.), see Glossary 34, 36, 102, 104, 108, 112, 126, 146, 184, 192, 544, 548, 666
infinitude 185
infinity, infinite 35, 37, 105, 109, 113, 147, 193, 227, 363, 545, 549, 666
infirmities 161, 195, 273, 291, 591
infralapsarianism, infralapsarians 4, 35, 36, 37
infusion 83, 297, 325, 327, 333, 337
of grace 267, 326
of righteousness 9, 329
Ingolstadt 267
ingratitude 59, 225, 239
iniquity 53, 187, 195, 201, 311, 329, 339, 421, 519, 543, 587
injustice 55, 203, 291
innate knowledge 217, 283, 369
innocence, innocent 117, 273, 307, 339, 343, 377, 439
Innocent III, pope 561
insanity, insane 271, 515, 533
instrument 109, 113, 143, 177, 211, 241, 285, 299, 309, 319, 321, 363, 379, 461, 597, 625
integrity 5, 31, 35, 57, 325, 355, 357, 385, 657
intellect 8, 9, 35, 211, 214, 237, 238, 243, 245, 247, 283, 285, 287, 289, 319, 335
intellectus (n.) 34, 35, 236, 240, 242, 244, 246, 282, 284, 286, 288, 662

intention 17, 39, 145, 227, 347, 351, 403, 415, 459, 483, 545, 547, 549
intercession, intercessors 123, 125, 127, 139, 177, 195, 273, 421
interior (adj.) 230, 258, 334, 372, 385
internal call 223, 225
internus (adj.) 144, 184, 208, 220, 222, 224, 236, 240, 256, 258, 260, 290, 310, 328, 346, 354, 360, 368, 372, 414, 416, 424, 426, 428, 432, 496, 541, 572, 574, 588, 596, 598, 620, 662
invocation 413, 419, 427
inward, inwardly 7, 14, 16, 111, 213, 221, 223, 239, 241, 261, 275, 373, 417, 425, 589, 597, 621, 661
Irenaeus of Lyons 95, 147, 391, 530, 531, 566
Isidore of Seville 567
Islamic 525
Israel, Israelites 87, 121, 179, 225, 279, 293, 377, 389, 395, 431, 437, 483, 485, 487, 571, 575, 585, 603, 611
Italy, Italian 93, 463, 503, 562

Jacob 75, 151, 433, 485, 487, 565
Jansenius or Cornelius Jansen 251
Jansonius, Adrianus 277
Jehovah 31, 50, 51, 106, 346, 394, 395, 427, 484, 485, 486, 487, 557
Jephtah 487
Jericho 614, 615
Jerome 133, 353, 355, 479, 567, 635
Jerusalem 167, 391, 426, 427, 433, 435, 447, 468, 469, 507, 520, 521, 565, 574, 575, 598, 599, 609, 612, 613, 615, 653
Jesse 75, 159
Jesuit 151, 161, 237, 245, 267, 329, 337, 505, 507, 508, 513, 515, 527, 543, 547, 551, 623
Jesus 5, 7, 11, 31, 35, 39, 41, 47, 75, 95, 96, 101, 105, 107, 113, 117, 123, 167, 181, 183, 185, 192, 199, 202, 209, 211, 213, 217, 219, 225, 235, 255, 279, 285, 291, 299, 315, 317, 319, 327, 345, 347, 365, 367, 369, 381, 391, 419, 423, 439, 545, 561, 571, 601, 609, 617, 621, 627, 631, 635, 649
Jesus Sirach 15, 365
Jew, Jewish 6, 11, 15, 37, 43, 79, 111, 121, 145, 217, 343, 375, 377, 379, 389, 391, 393, 395, 397, 401, 409, 417, 457, 463, 469, 471, 477, 491, 493, 525, 527, 531, 565, 627, 643
Job 431, 433, 439, 487, 547
Johannis, Adrianus 277
John Baptist de Mantua 539
John of Damascus 71, 87, 136, 137, 138, 140, 141
John the Baptist 109, 301, 467, 471, 601, 611, 645, 657
John XXII, pope 448, 531
Jonah 143, 433
Joris, David 570
Joseph 75, 77, 206, 207
Joseph of Arimathea 143
Josephus, Flavius 525
journey 167, 217, 367, 487, 525
joy, joyful 5, 15, 49, 51, 231, 297, 405, 439, 475, 477, 511, 557, 563, 565
Juan de Maldonado 151, 526
Jubilee 139, 555, 557
Judah 75, 79, 417
Judaism 471
Judas 133, 143, 145, 235, 295
Judas the Maccabean 507
Judea 79
judge 9, 141, 201, 305, 309, 325, 339, 367, 397, 479, 543, 637
judgment 9, 23, 25, 49, 53, 55, 57, 59, 65, 129, 135, 163, 169, 177, 179, 191, 193, 237, 259, 281, 305, 307, 317, 323, 325, 327, 339, 379, 395, 397, 417, 493, 495, 513, 521, 525, 531, 539, 573, 575, 587, 651
judgement-seat 305, 315
Julius Africanus 75
Junius, Franciscus 2, 119
jurisdiction 403, 601, 647
justice 25, 35, 39, 49, 55, 59, 61, 63, 65, 69, 91, 103, 119, 171, 183, 185, 197, 199, 201, 205, 213, 263, 305, 323, 326, 329, 333, 343, 377, 501, 513, 515, 521, 666
justification 1, 9, 13, 43, 51, 83, 111, 123, 182, 199, 201, 203, 227, 243, 255, 261, 263, 265, 293, 305, 307, 309, 311, 313, 315, 317, 319, 321, 323, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 313, 333, 335, 337, 339, 357, 373, 381, 383, 385, 499, 573
Justin Martyr 531, 566

Kaplan, Benjamin J. 159
Katwijk aan den Rijn 483
Kelly, John Norman Davidson 573
key of David 14, 659

key 13, 413, 579, 583, 601, 605, 617, 659
king 171, 409, 437, 593, 609, 611, 617, 647
kingdom of heaven, of God 31, 165, 173, 225, 229, 243, 271, 273, 279, 363, 381, 387, 409, 423, 425, 475, 511, 517, 557, 563, 565, 567, 569, 599, 601, 605, 611, 621, 627, 643, 647, 659
knee, knees, kneeling 125, 419, 431, 433
knowledge 7, 8, 23, 29, 35, 49, 77, 81, 141, 143, 195, 199, 209, 211, 221, 235, 243, 247, 249, 251, 253, 255, 257, 285, 319, 361, 377, 379, 415, 416, 417, 423, 497, 509, 519, 525, 527, 571, 595, 631, 633, 661, 663, 665, 666, 667, 668
koinonia (n.) 83, 89
Kolb, Robert 219
Koudekerke 277
Kraut, Richard 215
Kreitzer, Beth 421
Krop, Henri A. 49
Kwadijk 483

labor 194, 453, 457, 511, 563, 649
Lactantius 292, 293, 350, 351, 479, 531
ladder 29, 33
laity 597, 645
lamb 39, 53, 193, 195, 197, 207, 225, 567, 575, 577, 587
Lametti, David 447
Lane, Anthony N.S. 327
Laodicea 97, 141
latreia (n.) 417
Laurentius 479
law, ceremonial 10, 11, 333, 377, 381, 387, 388, 389, 393, 395, 407, 491
moral 10, 11, 253, 333, 347, 361, 377, 379, 381, 383, 385, 395, 407, 485, 495
Mosaic 10, 381, 385, 395, 397
political 10, 355, 377, 381, 387, 395, 397, 403
and Gospel 1, 67, 111, 121, 279, 281, 497
of God 123, 133, 201, 349, 359, 375, 388, 447
of nature 57, 395, 666
law-court 307
lawlessness 373
Lawrence, St. 471
lawyers 287, 448
laying-on of hands 195, 637, 639, 641
Lazarus 453, 513, 565
laziness 453
Le Goff, Jacques 561, 563, 591
Leeuwarden 209
Leiden 1, 7, 15, 16, 23, 67, 131, 209, 229, 238, 271, 397, 429, 461, 483, 605, 621, 625
Leipzig Interim 397
Lent(-fast) 469, 471, 473, 479
Leo I, pope 640, 641
Leo X, pope 557
Leontius 369
Lessius, Leonard 161
Leuven 519
Levi 123
Levirate marriage 75
Levites 629, 657
Levitic 123, 393
liability 35, 55, 123, 193, 273, 501, 515, 517, 519, 523, 541, 545
liberality 203, 311
Libertines 93, 159, 387, 561, 569, 570
liberty, Christian, see also freedom 9, 11, 403, 471
Libya 93
licentiousness 12, 479
lie 6, 43, 61, 67, 71, 149, 237, 311, 327, 389, 417, 535, 587, 595, 647
Lieburg, Fred A. van 23, 49, 67, 101, 139, 159, 181, 209, 277, 305, 343, 413, 443, 483, 499, 559, 621, 639
lifestyle 293, 467
light of nature 55, 221, 525
Limbo of infants 501, 557
Limbo of the fathers 149, 150, 151, 153, 168, 169, 501, 562, 563
Lind van Wijngaarden, Jan Daniël de 36
literal sense, meaning 111, 165, 171, 227, 251, 527, 664, 670
liturgy 11, 137, 347, 369, 398, 429
loan 443, 461, 463
logic 315, 323, 327, 503, 625
Logos (n.) 93, 97, 109, 165
Lombard, Peter 141, 291, 463, 477, 635
Lombardy 463
Loosjes, Jakob 209
Lord's Prayer 431, 569
Lord's Supper 63, 161, 397, 489, 493

Louvain 251
love for God 12, 261, 275, 287, 295, 323, 437, 443
for one's neighbour 12, 323, 355, 407, 437, 443, 445, 447, 457, 477
of Christ 185, 187, 199, 575
of God 4, 91, 103, 135, 185, 217, 273, 275, 279, 311, 379, 407
Lucius of Cyrene 631
Luke, the evangelist 217, 631, 633, 643.
lust 373, 487, 555
Luther, Martin 13, 97, 139, 149, 215, 219, 327, 385, 495, 542, 543, 557
Lutheran 7, 63, 81, 83, 89, 97, 98, 147, 167, 175, 219, 241, 397, 421, 511, 665
Lutheranism 97, 98, 161, 167
lutron (n.) 193, 311
lutrōsis (n.) 311
luxury 479
Lydia 217

Maas 535
Macarius 369, 435
Maccabees 507
Maccovius, Johannes 87, 139, 283
Macedonia 217
Maets, Carolus de 465
magistrate 47, 127, 387, 403, 405, 409, 461, 463, 613, 647, 655
Mahlmann, Theodor 305
majesty 99, 119, 129, 137, 173, 251, 425, 589, 611
Mäkinen, Virpi 447
Maldonado, Juan de 151, 527
Mammon 459
Manahen 631
Mani, Manes, founder of Manicheism 95
manumission 375, 407
Marcion 95, 151, 159, 557
Marcionites, Marcionism 95, 159, 163, 557
Mardenus, Moses 605
Marnix of Saint-Aldegonde, Philips 555
marriage 75, 93
martyr 191, 301, 363, 513, 547
martyrdom 203, 553, 609
Maruyama, Tadataka 571
Mary 6, 69, 77, 79, 81, 95, 96, 419, 421, 568
Mistress of the Earth 567
Queen of Heaven 567
Star of the Sea 567
mass 123, 125, 645
master 139, 145, 363, 375, 409, 423, 427, 569, 611
matriculation 23, 67, 101, 131, 159, 181, 209, 229, 277, 305, 343, 373, 413, 443, 483, 499, 559, 589, 621
matter 10, 11, 27, 29, 53, 85, 113, 143, 193, 197, 213, 229, 233, 251, 257, 261, 263, 283, 287, 317, 327, 343, 347, 381, 385, 387, 399, 401, 405, 419, 432, 437, 471, 491, 493, 495, 503, 519, 521, 523, 527, 529, 537, 539, 553, 611, 615, 651, 662, 668, 672
Maurice 609
Maximus of Turin 478
McClure, Judith 533
McGinnis, Andrew 87, 98
McGrath, Alister E. 202, 305, 327, 329
McGuckin, John A. 81, 83, 89
mediation 41, 105, 111, 113, 115, 117, 119, 421, 423, 666
mediator, mediatorial 6, 39, 69, 85, 91, 101, 105, 107, 109, 111, 113, 115, 117, 119, 123, 125, 129, 131, 173, 211, 251, 253, 309, 311, 379, 419, 421, 423, 427, 589
Medina 259, 552
meditation 427, 475
meeting 13, 133, 487, 559, 565, 569, 577, 579, 639, 651
meetings 569, 573, 581
Meijer, Theodorus Josephus 209
Meisner, Balthasar 305
Melanchthon, Philip 97, 181, 570
Melchizedek 123, 423
Melle 131
member 5, 14, 39, 41, 43, 67, 127, 177, 243, 329, 379, 383, 423, 449, 451, 457, 485, 523, 549, 551, 561, 569, 591, 593, 597, 599, 613, 621, 639, 655
mendicancy 453, 455, 493, 495
Menno Simons 95, 303
Mennonites 97
menstrual blood 77
mercy 5, 13, 25, 31, 35, 37, 39, 45, 47, 51, 53, 59, 61, 69, 91, 103, 125, 183, 185, 197, 199, 213, 219, 225, 229, 235, 279, 307, 311, 321, 323, 333, 339, 369, 423, 442, 443, 455, 463, 479, 497, 501, 513, 515, 519, 559

merit 8, 9, 39, 41, 49, 61, 91, 99, 125, 175, 181, 183, 185, 202, 203, 235, 253, 265, 267, 279, 291, 298, 309, 311, 313, 317, 319, 321, 323, 327, 328, 329, 331, 333, 335, 337, 349, 361, 363, 365, 369, 371, 373, 379, 423, 455, 465, 499, 519, 525, 535, 545, 555
Mesopotamia 435
Messalinians 435
Messiah 15, 111, 195, 247, 389, 391, 409
metanoia (n.) 281, 293
metaphor, metaphorical 111, 171, 237, 339, 375, 523, 605
metonym, metonymy 231, 263, 337, 593, 615
Micah 643
Middelburg 23, 159, 413, 433
Middelie 483
Miedziboz, Andreas, or Wojciech Rościszewski 623
Migne, J.P. 478
Miguel de Medina 259
Milan 502
Milton, Anthony 165
mind 8, 25, 121, 135, 141, 207, 211, 215, 235, 237, 255, 263, 273, 289, 319, 385, 401, 479, 481, 487, 491, 513, 651
minister 14, 181, 209, 299, 337, 343, 429, 437, 571, 597, 599, 613, 621, 625, 627, 629, 631, 633, 635, 645, 647, 655, 659
ministry 7, 131, 155, 211, 221, 259, 283, 317, 379, 513, 557, 567, 571, 585, 597, 599, 607, 621, 623, 625, 631, 639, 641, 643, 657
Mirabilis, Christina, or Christina the Astonishing 535
miracles 8, 231, 233, 235, 237, 239, 585, 587, 631, 643, 644, 645
Miriam 567
mirror of the Trinity 415
misery 5, 105, 219, 411, 443, 519
mode 77, 115, 121, 193, 213, 214, 215, 265, 319, 337, 357, 386, 425, 459, 467, 477, 519, 551, 553, 561, 615, 666
modest, modesty 23, 65
modus (n.), see Glossary 24, 26, 30, 50, 52, 54, 76, 78, 88, 104, 114, 120, 122, 126, 130, 132, 142, 164, 166, 192, 200, 206, 212, 214, 220, 222, 224, 236, 244, 248, 258, 262, 264, 276, 278, 286, 290, 292, 298, 318, 320, 336, 354, 356, 362, 378, 386, 392, 396, 424, 426, 444, 448, 452, 458, 476, 506, 518, 534, 548, 550, 552, 560, 564, 576, 598, 628, 614, 666
Mohammed 525
Mohammedans 525, 587
Molina, Luis de 237, 267
Molinist 285
monarch 593, 609, 611
monarchianism 93
Monarchians 301
monarchy 611, 647
monastery 97, 491, 495, 497, 567
monastic movement, order 435, 453, 587
monastic rule 491, 495
monastic vow 331, 349, 451, 489, 491
money 447, 463, 465, 475, 555
Monfasani, John 49, 57
Mongus, Peter 97
monks 81, 349, 435, 447, 451, 453, 457, 493, 495, 533, 585, 605
Monophysites 89, 97
Monson, Don 137
monstrosity 613
Montanism 93
moon 575
moral certainty 335
moral law 10, 11, 253, 291, 333, 347, 361, 377, 379, 381, 383, 385, 395, 407, 485, 495
moral persuasion 237, 285, 291
Mordecai 469
mortal guilt, mortal sin 257, 383, 517, 541, 543
mortal (of people) 13, 79, 91, 125, 149, 193, 205, 207, 251, 575
mortality 159, 207
mortification 147, 381
Moses 11, 313, 367, 389, 393, 395, 397, 409, 427, 431, 439, 469, 565, 585, 627, 629
mourning 469, 475
Muller, Richard A. 2, 3, 255
Münster 397, 447
murderer 511, 513, 527
Musculus, Wolfgang 205
mystery 67, 113, 138, 205, 217, 389, 587, 599, 635, 643, 657, 659
mystic, mystical 127, 215, 449, 573, 595, 613, 631

Nagtglas, Frederick 433
Nathan 75
Nathanael 603

nation 27, 43, 55, 75, 377, 379, 389, 391, 395, 403, 433, 455, 461, 463, 477, 483, 485, 569, 571, 575, 585, 617, 631, 649
natura (n.), see Glossary 28, 30, 50, 52, 56, 66, 70, 76, 78, 80, 82, 84, 86, 88, 90, 94, 102, 108, 110, 112, 114, 116, 118, 120, 124, 130, 136, 138, 144, 148, 156, 160, 164, 172, 174, 184, 190, 200, 204, 208, 212, 218, 220, 224, 230, 242, 260, 268, 272, 274, 278, 280, 282, 288, 294, 320, 322, 334, 372, 376, 394, 396, 400, 410, 448, 460, 466, 516, 524, 558, 594, 566, 666
natural calling 209, 211
  death 135
  freedom 375, 376
  law 448, 553, 666
  man 211, 215, 287
  power 239, 289
naturalis (adj.) and *naturalilter* (adv.), see Glossary 72, 74, 78, 80, 81, 114, 134, 138, 142, 158, 168, 204, 208, 210, 214, 218, 238, 278, 284, 286, 290, 354, 374, 394, 414, 484, 490, 494, 540, 541, 667, 668
nature 5, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 29, 31, 51, 53, 55, 57, 67, 69, 71, 73, 75, 77, 79, 81, 83, 85, 87, 89, 91, 95, 97, 103, 109, 111, 113, 115, 117, 119, 121, 125, 137, 139, 145, 157, 161, 165, 173, 175, 185, 201, 205, 209, 211, 213, 217, 219, 221, 231, 237, 243, 261, 269, 273, 275, 281, 283, 295, 323, 326, 335, 373, 377, 381, 395, 397, 401, 411, 419, 423, 449, 469, 491, 517, 525, 529, 541, 559, 567, 581, 589, 595, 607, 664, 666, 667, 668
Nauclerus, Johannes 555
Nazarenes 391
Nazarites 493
necessarius (adj.) 32, 38, 120, 138, 154, 200, 206, 210, 240, 250, 252, 254, 262, 266, 268, 280, 296, 298, 322, 324, 326, 330, 338, 348, 354, 372, 378, 382, 398, 404, 412, 414, 424, 426, 428, 430, 434, 438, 466, 470, 472, 474, 496, 502, 504, 538, 546, 548, 570, 574, 582, 620, 622, 632, 642
necessary, necessarily 6, 8, 11, 18, 31, 33, 39, 55, 73, 107, 113, 139, 155, 175, 183, 191, 201, 205, 207, 223, 237, 239, 241, 249, 253, 263, 269, 281, 289, 293, 297, 299, 303, 323, 331, 339, 349, 355, 357, 373, 379, 389, 391, 393, 403, 405, 415, 416, 425, 427, 429, 431, 439, 467, 473, 475, 491, 493, 497, 499, 501, 503, 507, 515, 547, 551, 569, 571, 575, 609, 621, 623, 635, 643, 657, 659, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 667
necessitas (n.), see Glossary 48, 104, 106, 130, 134, 142, 200, 202, 240, 268, 354, 357, 372, 390, 392, 396, 402, 403, 410, 414, 416, 422, 430, 436, 442, 450, 452, 454, 458, 460, 466, 468, 478, 484, 492, 522, 610, 628, 663, 667, 669
necessity 45, 105, 107, 143, 181, 183, 201, 203, 205, 207, 333, 355, 357, 391, 393, 403, 411, 415, 437, 453, 469, 493, 665, 667
needs 415, 417, 423, 431, 437, 443, 451, 455, 465, 495, 633
neighbor 10, 12, 49, 323, 343, 351, 355, 361, 405, 407, 437, 443, 445, 449, 457, 459, 469, 477, 483, 495, 497
Nestorius 79, 80, 83, 88, 89, 96, 97, 271
Netherlands, The 169, 303, 387, 437, 461, 569, 570, 639
New England 385
Nicene Creed 147
Nicephorus 473
Nicodemites 641
Nicodemus 143
Nicolaides, Theophilus, pseudonym of Valentinus Smalcius 623, 625, 655
Nicolas of Clémanges 617
Nicolas of Lyra 53
Nicomachean Ethics 215, 287, 352, 459
Niesel, Wilhelm 138
Nieuwerkerk 413
Nieuwveen 621
Nisibis 509
Noah 445, 547
nomen (n.), see Glossary 24, 52, 70, 72, 74, 88, 102, 108, 120, 124, 130, 132, 136, 138, 142, 148, 164, 168, 172, 176, 178, 188, 192, 210, 230, 246, 248, 252, 290, 292, 306, 310, 314, 322, 350, 356, 360, 362, 372, 376, 412, 418, 422, 434, 438, 462, 482, 500, 502, 518, 522, 526, 528, 538, 556, 570, 574, 576, 584, 586, 594, 596, 598, 600, 602, 612, 614, 624, 626, 634, 636, 644, 648, 656, 667
nominalist 203, 245
nonbeing 551
non-Christian 351, 352
non-elect 27, 57
Noonan, F. Thomas 435

Noord-Scharwoude 343
Northumbria 533
nota (n.) 15, 48, 50, 122, 348, 356, 388, 524, 558, 560, 582, 584, 585, 586, 588
notitia (n.) 28, 29, 35, 194, 234, 242, 246, 248, 250, 252, 318, 319, 422, 667, 668
notitia approbativa (n., adj.), see Glossary 28, 29, 35, 667, 668
notitia simplex (n., adj.), see Glossary 28, 29, 35, 667, 668
Novatian 301
Nubia 95
numerical identity 161
Nuremberg 111

oath 12, 483, 485
Obadiah 643
obedience 6, 35, 41, 45, 99, 101, 107, 121, 125, 133, 145, 155, 177, 183, 185, 188, 191, 201, 202, 203, 263, 273, 305, 307, 309, 311, 315, 321, 331, 335, 339, 345, 355, 357, 359, 385, 387, 407, 409, 485, 489, 493, 495, 633, 649
Oberman, Heiko A. 267, 517, 573
object 3, 4, 11, 29, 33, 35, 41, 55, 67, 117, 121, 197, 213, 229, 231, 237, 241, 249, 251, 253, 257, 261, 263, 273, 319, 321, 323, 325, 381, 405, 413, 415, 416, 437, 447, 483, 489, 497, 559, 605, 611, 641, 665, 667
objection 33, 243, 410, 507, 515, 525, 543, 623, 627, 629, 639, 651, 653
objective 103, 145
obol 447
Ochino, Bernardino 93
Ockham, William of 415
oeconomia (n.), see Glossary 66, 68, 70, 132, 172, 178, 184, 308, 592, 594, 663, 668
oeconomicus (adj.), see Glossary 70, 116, 128, 172, 178, 386, 590, 620
offender 61
offense 53, 59, 101, 117, 187, 297, 351, 393, 405, 441, 607, 651
offering 107, 111, 123, 145, 179, 187, 193, 195, 197, 205, 299, 427, 449, 457, 507, 523, 529
office 5, 6, 15, 27, 83, 85, 91, 101, 103, 109, 111, 113, 117, 119, 123, 127, 129, 131, 133, 159, 163, 177, 181, 185, 189, 203, 229, 409, 410, 423, 451, 499, 555, 569, 579, 595, 597, 599, 607, 613, 615, 623, 625, 627, 629, 633, 637, 639, 641, 643, 645, 649, 653, 655, 657
office-bearers 597, 657
officers, governmental 397
omnipotence 99
omnipotent power 227
omnipresence 87, 99, 165, 175
omniscience 29, 99
only-begotten Son 79, 103, 419
Oosterend 343
Oostzaan 209
Opstal, Alexander Gijsbert van 131
oracle from the Holy Spirit 653
ordination 3, 25, 143, 209, 637, 639, 641, 645, 655, 659
Origen 147, 205, 207, 529, 531, 573, 639, 643
original sin 375, 385, 517, 541
orthodox, orthodoxy 4, 19, 33, 37, 63, 81, 89, 93, 98, 105, 111, 133, 153, 169, 243, 337, 365, 369, 391, 419, 461, 581, 643, 647
  Reformed 1, 19, 63, 105, 133, 243, 419
Osiander, Andreas 111
Ostorodt, Christoph 624, 625, 626, 628, 629, 654, 655
Oude Niedorp 101
Oudkarspel 343
Oud-Vossemeer 559
outpouring 99, 171, 339, 443
outward, outwardly 7, 13, 14, 27, 113, 115, 137, 145, 153, 177, 187, 213, 221, 223, 231, 241, 261, 345, 349, 385, 389, 391, 393, 399, 403, 425, 429, 445, 451, 455, 469, 475, 477, 491, 497, 541, 557, 569, 577, 581, 589, 621, 661
overseer 437, 471, 599, 607, 615, 629, 635, 637, 639, 641, 643, 645, 649, 651, 653, 659

pactum salutis (n.) 101
pagan 216, 343, 351, 352, 353, 525
pain 73, 133, 135, 149, 155, 511, 513
Pajon, Claude 229, 238
Paludanus, Gerardus Theodorus 483
pamphlets of original disputations 14, 17
Panigarola, Francesco 503
papacy 495, 593
papal theologians, papal teachers 113, 123, 125, 127, 151, 169, 255, 267, 293, 297, 299, 325, 337, 347, 349, 355, 357, 359, 361, 363, 365, 369, 387, 409, 415, 417, 421, 429, 439, 471, 473, 477, 497, 499, 501, 509, 511, 517, 521, 525, 527, 529, 531, 533, 537,

539, 541, 545, 547, 553, 557, 561, 563, 567, 583, 585, 587, 599, 623, 627, 635, 655, 659
papist 479, 505, 617
parable 7, 223, 231, 297, 303, 363, 425, 457, 573
Paradise 151, 159, 167, 171, 207, 445, 511, 535, 565
pardonable sins 359
parents 489, 491
parent, first 57, 131, 343
Paris 151, 505
Parker, Charles H. 461
Partee, Charles 421
passive obedience 309
Passover 489
pastor 19, 127, 229, 241, 373, 431, 433, 457, 508, 571, 574, 592, 627, 629, 631, 633, 637, 639, 641, 643, 645, 647, 649, 651, 653, 655
patience 55, 57, 135, 155, 519, 521
patriarchs, biblical 121, 557, 615, 629
patriarchs, catholic 649
patronage of ministers, secular 655
Paul, the apostle 33, 43, 45, 51, 59, 65, 75, 153, 167, 171, 173, 175, 177, 217, 233, 249, 253, 257, 265, 271, 279, 295, 313, 335, 353, 363, 367, 383, 387, 391, 399, 401, 415, 431, 439, 453, 471, 487, 491, 509, 551, 553, 567, 569, 575, 577, 579, 589, 599, 601, 609, 613, 625, 627, 631, 633, 635, 649, 653, 659
Paul of Samosate 93, 580
Paul VI, pope 471
pawnbrokers 463
peace 16, 103, 189, 195, 199, 275, 301, 373, 389, 405, 475, 511, 567, 571
peacemaking 195
Peasants' War 447
pedagogue, pedagogical teaching of jews 389, 447
Pelagian, Pelagianism 5, 23, 25, 43, 45, 57, 61, 269, 291, 573
Pelagius 43, 239
Pelikan, Jaroslav 567, 568
Pels, Dick 448
penalty 103, 117, 123, 135, 183, 201, 291, 395, 515, 517, 519, 527, 533, 535, 541, 543, 545, 557
penance 295, 303, 357, 501, 553
penitence 9, 277, 291, 293, 297, 298, 299, 301, 475, 535, 537, 539, 543, 545, 553
penitent 293, 295, 475, 541, 545, 553, 557
Pentecost 471
perception of the senses 517
perdition 55, 235, 617
perfectio (n.), see Glossary 78, 126, 216, 282, 356, 358, 392, 450, 454, 606, 666, 668
perfection 135, 217, 283, 357, 359, 393, 451, 455, 607, 666, 667, 668
perfectionism 359
Peripatetics 105
Perkins, William 3, 37
permission of sin by God 4, 37
persecution 171, 301, 531, 437, 529, 553, 563, 571, 583
perseverance 5, 8, 24, 25, 31, 43, 45, 61, 223, 228, 229, 263, 265, 267, 269, 273, 275, 323, 347
Persian, Persians 95, 509
person 1, 3, 6, 67, 69, 71, 79, 81, 83, 85, 87, 89, 91, 93, 95, 97, 101, 113, 115, 123, 131, 135, 137, 141, 145, 149, 153, 165, 179, 181, 185, 193, 195, 197, 201, 203, 207, 215, 217, 237, 243, 257, 265, 267, 269, 273, 283, 285, 295, 307, 311, 317, 326, 329, 331, 345, 367, 375, 383, 403, 415, 437, 445, 449, 453, 457, 459, 461, 469, 485, 505, 517, 521, 535, 537, 549, 591, 603, 605, 607, 613, 637, 663, 665, 667, 668
Person of Christ, of the Son of God 1, 3, 6, 9, 45, 61, 67, 69, 71, 79, 81, 83, 85, 87, 89, 91, 93, 95, 97, 101, 113, 115, 123, 131, 135, 141, 145, 149, 153, 165, 181, 185, 193, 197, 201, 203, 383, 403, 445
persona (n.), see Glossary 24, 28, 42, 46, 66, 68, 70, 78, 80, 81, 82, 84, 86, 88, 90, 92, 94, 96, 100, 114, 116, 122, 130, 136, 152, 180, 184, 192, 194, 196, 202, 221, 306, 308, 310, 342, 344, 382, 394, 396, 418, 436, 444, 448, 452, 456, 458, 468, 484, 492, 594, 602, 604, 612, 616, 665, 668, 672
Peshitta 605
Peter, Carl 331
Peter, the apostle 14, 33, 53, 59, 127, 261, 297, 301, 391, 401, 425, 437, 471, 505, 565, 593, 597, 599, 601, 603, 605, 607, 609, 617, 635, 647, 649, 659
petra (n.) 594, 600, 602, 603, 604, 616
Pharisee 425, 429, 479
philanthropy 185, 219, 311
Philemon 609

Philip II, king of Spain 529
Philip IV, king of France 555
Philip the deacon 653
Philip the disciple 603
Philippi 633, 635, 652
Philippians 609
Philistines 433
Philoponus 95
philosopher 97, 215, 216, 287, 375
philosophy 10, 73, 101, 215, 245, 291, 305, 343, 499, 527, 664, 665, 666, 667, 669, 671, 672
Phocas, emperor 609
Phormio, comedy 473
Photinus 93
Piedmont 463
Pierson, Christopher 445, 448, 449
piety 241, 267, 275, 347, 349, 355, 361, 445, 455, 475, 493, 495, 497, 537
Pighius, Albert 247
Pilate 133, 141, 143, 145
pilgrim 3, 509, 555
pilgrimage 349, 435, 495
pious people, pious persons 5, 49, 351, 369, 381, 451, 461, 487, 489, 511, 519, 521, 523, 563, 565
pirates 47
Piscator, Johannes 202, 309
Plancius, Isaac 181
Platina, Bartolomeo, or Bartolomeo Sacchi 554, 555
Plato 375, 421, 525
pleasure 5, 31, 39, 47, 51, 71, 103, 135, 147, 183, 213, 217, 223, 225, 235, 425, 465, 475, 561
plērophoria (n.) 11, 223, 253, 405
Poitou, French province 131
Poland 93, 97, 625
Polanus, Amandus von Polansdorf 39
polemics 531, 573, 589, 641, 655
Polish language 623
politics 11, 387, 449, 593
Polyander, Johannes 2, 4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 14, 15, 35, 101, 105, 111, 127, 209, 213, 216, 217, 219, 223, 311, 343, 346, 351, 359, 361, 367, 388, 483, 493, 495, 588, 621, 623, 625, 626, 627, 633, 635, 637, 639, 641, 643, 645, 647
polyglot bible 605
pontiff, Roman 609, 645, 647, 649
poor 151, 331, 391, 443, 445, 447, 449, 451, 453, 455, 459, 461, 463, 465, 471, 475, 535, 537, 563, 631, 653
Pope, Stephen J. 451
pope 123, 125, 127, 139, 448, 471, 474, 505, 531, 541, 551, 545, 555, 557, 561, 589, 593, 597, 599, 607, 609, 611, 613, 615, 617, 618, 619, 647
  Alexander VI 474
  Boniface III 609
  Boniface VIII 555
  Celestine V 555
  Clement VI 139
  Clement VIII 555
  Gregory I, Gregory the Great 95, 298, 609, 618, 619
  Gregory X 611
  Innocent III 561
  John XXII 448, 531
  Leo I 640, 641
  Leo X 557
  Paul VI 471
  Sixtus IV 555
  Sixtus V 555
  authority of the 13, 505, 551, 557
Porphyrius 97
potentia (n.), see Glossary 30, 63, 70, 80, 102, 105, 172, 192, 199, 214, 216, 217, 232, 238, 244, 246, 250, 274, 308, 322, 324, 328, 368, 424, 594, 614, 661, 665, 668, 669
Pourçain 153, 242, 245, 259, 544
poverty 331, 439, 445, 447, 448, 449, 451, 455, 467, 489, 493, 495, 541
practical syllogism 8, 10, 255
praescientia (n.) 24, 54, 56, 669
Praxeas 93
prayer 9, 11, 12, 51, 113, 123, 135, 177, 179, 267, 281, 289, 369, 385, 413, 415, 417, 419, 421, 423, 425, 427, 429, 431, 433, 435, 437, 439, 443, 467, 475, 477, 479, 487, 491, 493, 497, 507, 529, 531, 533, 543, 547, 549, 633
preacher 93, 211, 213, 227, 309, 503, 529, 557, 631, 649
preaching 13, 19, 23, 113, 139, 215, 217, 241, 265, 277, 309, 325, 347, 379, 397, 523, 557, 571, 581, 583, 603, 605, 627, 629, 641, 647, 649, 651, 653
predestination 1, 2, 3, 4, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 31, 35, 37, 51, 57, 63, 67, 209, 573
predication 85, 87, 662

preincarnate Christ 125
presbyter 93, 301, 599, 635, 637, 639, 641, 645, 649, 651, 653
Presbyterianism 639
presbytery 637, 639, 641, 651, 655
prevenient grace 289, 327, 345
priest, catholic 83, 111, 125, 337, 439, 481, 613, 619, 635, 637, 649
jewish 123, 125, 133, 193, 203, 205, 431, 629, 657
priestess 421
primacy of the pope 123, 589, 597, 601, 603, 607, 609
principium (n.), see Glossary 72, 84, 112, 114, 206, 220, 242, 258, 308, 344, 368, 394, 524, 536, 590, 596, 626, 642, 669, 670
principle 10, 109, 113, 115, 117, 125, 161, 163, 213, 214, 259, 309, 345, 387, 395, 525, 537, 591, 627, 639, 661, 667
privation of grace 59
prodigal son 297
progress 8, 265, 283, 361, 393
promise 8, 12, 75, 107, 121, 221, 223, 231, 233, 235, 253, 255, 259, 265, 267, 273, 279, 281, 285, 297, 309, 319, 321, 349, 365, 367, 413, 427, 435, 443, 449, 465, 483, 485, 489, 497, 513, 543, 563, 569, 571, 575, 583, 601, 603, 605, 607, 631, 655
properties 14, 73, 81, 83, 85, 87, 89, 91, 99, 113, 161, 185, 205, 241, 249, 277, 291, 295, 323, 343, 355, 419, 421, 445, 447, 448, 567, 661, 662, 663, 665, 666, 668
prophet 15, 47, 95, 107, 121, 137, 151, 195, 217, 253, 347, 359, 393, 415, 427, 431, 433, 557, 563, 571, 581, 599, 615, 621, 623, 625, 627, 629, 631, 633, 645
propitiation 103, 311
proprie (adv.), see Glossary 36, 50, 70, 110, 112, 124, 132, 158, 170, 172, 174, 180, 230, 240, 252, 276, 292, 304, 318, 324, 332, 362, 378, 386, 402, 418, 466, 474, 488, 522, 548, 558, 574, 576, 580, 612, 665
Prosper of Aquitane 22, 23, 24, 60, 61
Protestant 15, 16, 111, 151, 165, 247, 325, 327, 352, 461, 531, 570, 573, 589, 623, 639, 662
Protestantism 63, 305, 463
providence 2, 3, 17, 25, 37, 49, 57, 59, 63, 141, 223, 417, 557
proximate end or goal 11, 199, 229, 261, 275, 405
proximus (adj.), see Glossary 48, 126, 130, 184, 198, 202, 228, 260, 274, 322, 332, 336, 344, 350, 364, 404, 406, 436, 442, 444, 456, 458, 468, 476, 482, 494, 496, 558, 646, 670, 671
prudence 23, 263, 333, 451, 459
Prudentius 531, 546, 547
psalms 14, 137, 419
Pseudo-Augustine 411
pseudo-Christians 6, 93, 95
psychology 662
punctuation 17
punishment 25, 53, 55, 103, 129, 133, 137, 145, 149, 151, 183, 187, 189, 191, 192, 193, 195, 197, 199, 201, 291, 295, 315, 331, 355, 367, 369, 376, 387, 455, 477, 501, 503, 511, 513, 515, 517, 519, 521, 523, 525, 527, 529, 531, 533, 535, 539, 541, 543, 545, 547, 549, 553, 557
purgatory 1, 9, 12, 13, 16, 303, 417, 477, 499, 501, 503, 505, 507, 509, 511, 513, 515, 517, 525, 527, 529, 531, 533, 535, 537, 541, 543, 547, 553, 561
Puritans 431
Purmerend 483

qualitas (n.), see Glossary 42, 72, 160, 184, 188, 242, 244, 246, 264, 286, 288, 318, 324, 328, 336, 356, 366, 500, 528, 670
quality 9, 43, 71, 73, 83, 145, 161, 185, 237, 243, 245, 247, 265, 267, 287, 289, 315, 319, 325, 329, 337, 357, 367, 501, 517, 545, 579, 605, 662, 663, 666
quantity 73, 135, 185, 245, 670
Quenstedt, Johann Andreas 247
Quran 525

Rabbinic 409
Rabin, Andrew 533
Racovian Catechism 16, 111, 263, 623, 626
Rahner, Karl 295
Rahtmann, Hermann 241
Ramist 323
Ramus, Peter 323
ransom 113, 135, 193, 197, 311, 379, 457, 521, 537
ratio (n.), see Glossary 22, 44, 46, 48, 50, 58, 60, 62, 66, 70, 72, 76, 88, 100, 106, 108, 116,

118, 122, 124, 130, 132, 134, 138, 140, 142, 144, 148, 150, 154, 168, 174, 186, 194, 196, 200, 214, 222, 236, 238, 240, 244, 248, 252, 256, 258, 260, 262, 264, 268, 272, 312, 316, 318, 328, 330, 346, 348, 360, 362, 364, 388, 394, 396, 398, 400, 422, 456, 458, 462, 464, 466, 468, 474, 476, 484, 490, 498, 500, 502, 506, 508, 512, 516, 518, 524, 530, 544, 546, 548, 556, 566, 578, 582, 590, 592, 600, 602, 604, 622, 632, 644, 648, 670
rational soul 73, 97, 235, 237
Ray, Stephen K. 603
reason 63, 249, 395
Rechabites 493
reconciliation 119, 123, 199, 261, 265, 273, 307, 309, 355, 379
redemption 4, 6, 7, 13, 37, 91, 111, 115, 119, 125, 131, 139, 147, 183, 189, 193, 199, 207, 311, 315, 339, 345, 373, 389, 407, 419, 551, 595
Reeling Brouwer, Rinse H. 17
Reformation 13, 93, 385, 447, 573, 643
Reformed theology, theologians 3, 17, 53, 125, 153, 175, 201, 205, 223, 365, 403, 415, 447, 573, 641, 661
reformer 16, 63, 93, 97, 111, 167, 215, 331, 352, 447, 573, 641, 645
regeneration 9, 273, 277, 279, 281, 283, 285, 287, 291, 297, 321, 326, 327, 329, 343, 353, 357, 661, 665
Regensburg 327, 513
relatio (n.), see Glossary 40, 68, 258, 316, 368, 670
religion 95, 275, 335, 351, 355, 385, 455, 489, 491, 609, 627
remission 105, 199, 203, 299, 309, 313, 326, 331, 381, 465, 501, 513, 515, 519, 521, 545, 555
Remonstrants 1, 3, 5, 43, 199, 203, 269
remotus (adj.), see Glossary 90, 142, 228, 323, 434, 486, 642, 670, 671
renewal 9, 273, 277, 279, 283, 287, 289, 326, 335, 397
repentance 1, 3, 9, 12, 18, 33, 213, 269, 273, 277, 279, 281, 283, 285, 289, 291, 293, 295, 297, 301, 303, 305, 321, 343, 381, 425, 467, 475, 477, 491, 497, 521, 523, 539, 541, 553, 579, 607
repetition of a disputation cycle 1, 2, 16, 213, 309, 315, 457
reprobate 25, 35, 37, 41, 51, 57, 255, 271, 573
reprobation 3, 5, 25, 27, 33, 51, 53, 55, 57, 59, 61, 63
republic 1, 355, 397, 647
resurrection 6, 97, 109, 141, 159, 161, 163, 169, 277, 281, 391, 405, 407, 409, 479, 531, 533, 565
retribution 477, 513
Reusius, Nicolaus 101
revelation 3, 8, 199, 233, 235, 237, 241, 257, 335, 367, 603, 629
Rhenen 499
Rieu, Willem N. du 23, 67, 101, 131, 159, 181, 209, 277, 305, 343, 373, 443, 483, 499, 559, 589, 621
righteousness 9, 69, 101, 103, 119, 121, 131, 161, 163, 171, 181, 183, 197, 199, 201, 202, 203, 205, 207, 215, 217, 235, 249, 263, 279, 281, 283, 285, 287, 293, 297, 301, 305, 307, 309, 311, 313, 315, 317, 319, 321, 323, 325, 326, 327, 329, 331, 333, 335, 337, 339, 341, 343, 347, 352, 353, 359, 361, 363, 367, 369, 381, 383, 385, 405, 409, 445, 465, 475, 477, 485, 497, 513, 519, 545, 547, 551
rite 13, 337, 377, 389, 393, 396, 430, 533, 577, 581, 625, 639, 671
Rivetus, Andreas 2, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 130, 131, 137, 139, 141, 147, 175, 228, 229, 233, 237, 238, 241, 247, 253, 259, 261, 269, 271, 372, 373, 381, 385, 388, 393, 395, 407, 409, 498, 499, 505, 507, 515, 523, 525, 531, 535, 539, 541, 644
Rivetus, Claudius 131
Rivetus, Samuel 131
Rochelle 373
Rogge, Joachim 385
Roman Catholic 8, 9, 11, 12, 15, 16, 161, 237, 247, 251, 259, 269, 295, 325, 327, 329, 333, 335, 337, 341, 343, 349, 359, 395, 429, 435, 471, 473, 479, 491, 495, 499, 501, 503, 509, 511, 523, 529, 555, 567, 573, 585, 593, 623, 627, 641, 645, 647, 665
  Church 151, 245, 271, 352, 473, 589, 597, 641, 645, 647
Roman Catholicism 499, 511
Roman Catholics 11, 269, 331, 435, 471, 479, 501, 539, 627
Roman empire 355

Rome 13, 93, 95, 151, 267, 291, 301, 327, 537, 543, 551, 555, 609, 627, 629, 633, 649
Rościszewski, Wojciech, or Andreas Miedziboz 623
Rotterdam 499, 589
Rufinus 24, 61, 525
rule of faith, of truth 367, 503
rule of love 459
ruler 79, 119, 171, 173, 201, 369, 593, 611
Rutherford, Samuel 105

Sá, Manuel de 528
Sabbath 143, 391, 471, 479, 481, 491
Sabellius 93
Sacchi, Bartolomeo, or Bartolomeo Platina 555
sackcloth 301, 431, 475
sacrament 1, 7, 13, 51, 221, 231, 239, 265, 271, 274, 295, 297, 299, 309, 317, 337, 485, 489, 501, 503, 513 519, 539, 543, 563, 571, 573, 577, 583, 585, 633, 641, 645, 653, 655
sacrifice 7, 101, 111, 119, 123, 125, 147, 157, 163, 177, 187, 195, 197, 199, 203, 205, 207, 213, 299, 339, 349, 377, 393, 395, 413, 421, 507
saints 11, 139, 169, 211, 263, 265, 267, 271, 275, 289, 301, 313, 331, 349, 359, 369, 379, 413, 415, 417, 419, 421, 423, 425, 429, 431, 433, 439, 457, 471, 477, 487, 495, 497, 533, 539, 545, 547, 549, 555, 557, 563, 565, 567, 571, 575, 587, 631
Salamanca 267, 529, 543, 553
salvation 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, 27, 31, 33, 37, 39, 41, 45, 57, 71, 85, 91, 99, 101, 103, 105, 107, 113, 119, 121, 131, 133, 137, 147, 173, 177, 181, 183, 199, 201, 203, 209, 211, 213, 215, 219, 221, 223, 225, 227, 229, 239, 247, 249, 251, 253, 261, 265, 269, 273, 275, 279, 281, 285, 289, 295, 307, 309, 323, 325, 327, 331, 335, 337, 349, 355, 357, 365, 369, 379, 383, 391, 409, 411, 417, 423, 439, 491, 513, 551, 555, 589, 663
Salvioni 508
Samaria 653
Samaritans 603
Samson 433
Samuel 487
sanctification 1, 9, 13, 33, 35, 37, 51, 109, 119, 163, 201, 227, 277, 305, 307, 323, 326, 327, 329, 373, 499
sanctuary 125, 165, 167, 171, 177, 179, 193, 195, 423, 433
Santing, Catrien 591
Sartorius 266, 538
Satan 142, 143, 163, 173, 177, 273, 285, 293, 377, 439, 569, 659
satisfaction 5, 6, 7, 9, 13, 39, 99, 105, 111, 119, 123, 147, 155, 163, 181, 183, 185, 187, 189, 193, 195, 197, 199, 201, 203, 205, 207, 253, 293, 299, 311, 313, 323, 325, 333, 335, 337, 339, 373, 379, 395, 499, 513, 515, 519, 521, 523, 537, 539, 543, 545, 547, 549, 551
Saul, the apostle Paul 631
Saumur 8, 131, 229, 237, 238
Savior 83, 85, 87, 131, 147, 155, 159, 163, 211, 219, 261, 279, 285, 299, 429, 631
Savoy 503
scandal 229, 303, 495, 575, 639, 651
Schalkwijk 499
Schiedam 483
Schierbeek 555
schism 581
Schlawitz 16, 81, 294
Schleitheim, Confession 387
Schmalz, Valentin, or Valentinus Smalcius 623
scholastic distinction 5, 6, 135
scholastic theology 87, 135, 261, 319, 671
scholasticism 10, 137, 245, 508, 666
Scholastics 25, 63, 89, 115, 137, 231, 237, 247, 257, 331, 445, 447, 509, 514, 662, 668, 669, 671
Schoolmen 105, 243
Schoppe, Caspar 511
Schwenckfeld, Kaspar 97
Schwenckfeldians 49
science 77, 245, 247, 249, 251, 407, 633
scientia (n.), see Glossary 29, 35, 36, 48, 80, 198, 244, 246, 248, 254, 414, 594, 632, 656, 663, 668, 671
Scipio 525
Scotus, John Duns 181, 245, 337, 415
scribes 105, 109, 365, 429
Scripture 3, 4, 7, 12, 14, 15, 17, 25, 27, 29, 33, 37, 39, 41, 43, 45, 47, 49, 51, 65, 67, 71, 105, 107, 109, 111, 119, 121, 133, 137, 141, 145, 149, 151, 153, 159, 161, 165, 167, 169, 171, 175, 181, 183, 187, 189, 197, 199, 201, 203, 213, 217, 221, 223, 231, 233, 239, 241, 243, 247, 249, 251, 253, 255,

269, 287, 289, 297, 301, 319, 321, 327, 331, 335, 349, 357, 361, 365, 367, 369, 383, 398, 413, 415, 417, 419, 423, 425, 437, 439, 463, 475, 477, 489, 491, 493, 501, 503, 505, 507, 508, 509, 511, 513, 519, 523, 527, 529, 531, 533, 537, 539, 541, 551, 557, 559, 563, 565, 567, 573, 575, 579, 583, 587, 589, 603, 609, 611, 613, 627, 631, 633, 641, 668
seal 51, 141, 203, 405, 407, 575, 585
Second Council of Orange 57
Second Helvetic Confession 409, 573
security 453, 463, 479
seed 7, 75, 77, 119, 143, 223, 241, 243, 273, 283, 343, 347, 367, 375, 661
Selderhuis, Herman J. 2, 639
self-authenticating 15, 365
self-convincing 365
self-examination 5, 51
Selnecker, Nikolaus 421
semi-Pelagianism 23, 24, 25, 43, 61, 291
senses 73, 137, 247, 257, 533, 557, 577, 591
Sepp, Christiaan 131
Septuagint 15, 186, 187, 195, 477, 531
servant 39, 73, 99, 107, 121, 125, 133, 195, 199, 205, 235, 281, 363, 365, 381, 405, 409, 427, 544, 561, 569, 593, 599, 611, 613, 615, 621, 635, 647, 655, 657
Servetus, Michael 93
Seth 71
sheep 29, 41, 53, 121, 147, 185, 197, 265, 575, 583, 593, 597, 601, 607, 609, 639, 645
shepherd 431, 437, 569, 583, 593, 597, 599, 647
Silas 633
Silesia 97
silver 51, 379, 525, 577
Simeon or Niger 631
Simons, Menno 95, 303
sin 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 25, 31, 35, 37, 41, 53, 55, 57, 59, 61, 69, 75, 77, 91, 101, 103, 105, 107, 113, 119, 121, 123, 125, 131, 137, 143, 145, 147, 155, 161, 163, 177, 183, 185, 187, 188, 189, 191, 193, 195, 197, 199, 201, 203, 205, 207, 213, 214, 221, 235, 243, 253, 255, 257, 261, 271, 277, 279, 281, 283, 285, 293, 295, 297, 299, 301, 303, 305, 307, 309, 313, 315, 319, 321, 325, 326, 327, 329, 331, 333, 335, 339, 343, 353, 355, 357, 359, 361, 373, 375, 377, 379, 381, 383, 385, 393, 403, 405, 411, 421, 423, 425, 437, 447, 465, 467, 469, 475, 477, 491, 497, 499, 501, 503, 507, 513, 515, 517, 519, 521, 523, 525, 535, 539, 541, 543, 545, 547, 549, 553, 555, 557, 575, 579, 655, 665, 667
sincerity 325, 359
Sinnema, Donald W. 1, 27, 36, 37, 53, 61, 127, 588
sinner 4, 5, 9, 37, 39, 55, 59, 85, 103, 123, 135, 137, 185, 187, 193, 201, 213, 215, 219, 221, 225, 253, 273, 281, 291, 295, 299, 303, 305, 307, 315, 323, 329, 331, 369, 389, 425, 463, 533, 547, 553, 633, 665
Sint-Annaland 559
Sistine Chapel 555
Sixtus IV, pope 555
Sixtus V, pope 555
Sixtus of Siena 531
slander 139, 469
slave 69, 363, 367, 375, 381, 389, 405, 407, 409, 419, 593, 599, 611, 653
slavery 10, 11, 121, 207, 373, 375, 377, 379, 381, 387, 405, 407, 561
sleep 73, 562, 613
Slovenia 531
Smalcius, Valentinus, or Valentin Schmalz 622, 623, 624, 654, 655
Sneek 209
sobriety 491
Socinians, Socinian 6, 7, 11, 16, 99, 111, 137, 163, 181, 192, 239, 325, 339, 409, 561, 623, 625, 626, 627, 653, 659
Socinus, Faustus 16, 93, 99, 105, 177, 187, 188, 203, 239, 263, 623, 625, 627, 629, 655
Socrates of Constantinople 453, 471
Soestius, Guilielmus, or Wilhelmus Soestius or Guilielmus Soustius 499
soldier 381, 485
Solomon 75, 171, 415, 431, 547
Son, Son of God 3, 6, 29, 31, 67, 69, 71, 73, 75, 77, 79, 81, 83, 87, 89, 91, 93, 97, 98, 103, 109, 111, 115, 117, 125, 131, 133, 139, 141, 143, 145, 155, 163, 173, 175, 181, 183, 185, 187, 191, 193, 197, 199, 201, 203, 207, 211, 219, 225, 237, 253, 257, 271, 305, 307, 309, 311, 315, 325, 345, 361, 375, 379, 383, 389, 413, 419, 423, 513, 547, 557, 565, 571, 585, 595, 601, 603, 605, 664
sons of God 47, 103, 119, 147, 229, 367, 389, 405, 449, 465, 509, 561

Sorbonne, Sorbonnian 63, 291
sorrow 9, 133, 135, 137, 139, 189, 191, 281, 295, 427, 601
soteriology 1, 2, 3, 6, 19
Soto, Domingo de 257, 327, 505, 552
Soto, Petrus de, or Pedro de Soto 504, 506, 507, 538, 539, 552, 553
soul 9, 12, 16, 39, 73, 75, 91, 93, 97, 109, 125, 133, 135, 137, 139, 141, 145, 149, 151, 153, 155, 159, 165, 169, 185, 189, 191, 195, 201, 215, 235, 237, 241, 243, 251, 253, 257, 261, 283, 285, 295, 297, 299, 301, 333, 365, 373, 379, 407, 409, 415, 423, 427, 433, 451, 467, 475, 477, 479, 497, 501, 507, 509, 511, 513, 515, 531, 533, 535, 547, 557, 561, 562, 563, 565, 567, 591, 639, 662
sovereignty 13, 377, 432, 589, 593, 595, 597, 599, 601, 605, 607, 611, 615
sower 7, 231
Spain 151
Spanish 567
special calling 7, 209, 467, 601, 625
special revelation 233, 257, 335
species (n.), see Glossary 94, 190, 230, 231, 234, 235, 244, 245, 252, 260, 268, 269, 270, 348, 400, 428, 444, 452, 462, 466, 476, 492, 508, 592, 622, 664, 665, 672
Spirit, Holy Spirit 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 23, 33, 35, 37, 51, 69, 71, 75, 77, 83, 87, 91, 93, 109, 111, 113, 115, 117, 123, 125, 127, 161, 163, 171, 173, 177, 185, 211, 215, 217, 219, 221, 223, 227, 235, 237, 239, 241, 255, 257, 265, 267, 271, 273, 275, 277, 279, 281, 283, 285, 287, 289, 291, 297, 309, 311, 317, 319, 323, 325, 326, 345, 346, 347, 353, 355, 361, 363, 379, 381, 383, 397, 405, 407, 413, 415, 421, 427, 433, 437, 449, 475, 479, 549, 575, 589, 595, 597, 599, 643, 653
  work of the 7, 223, 267
spirit, human 8, 12, 97, 109, 125, 255, 261, 293, 357, 387, 467, 563
sponsor 101, 315
square of opposition 321
Stad aan 't Haringvliet 413
Stapleton, Thomas 531
Statencollege in Leiden 43
Statenvertaling, Dutch Bible translation 14, 431
Stayer, James 447
Steinmetz, David C. 63
Stephen 171, 437, 653
Stoic 49, 397, 409
Strasbourg 93
Strehle, Stephen 111, 181, 203
stubbornness 211, 401
Styx, the river 547
Suárez, Francisco 161, 244, 245, 259, 329, 333, 335
subaltern 321
substance 10, 45, 71, 73, 77, 141, 153, 161, 245, 298, 327, 379, 395, 403, 493, 597, 661, 668
substantia (n.), see Glossary 74, 76, 378, 394, 492, 663, 665, 672
suffering 6, 49, 73, 99, 133, 135, 137, 145, 147, 153, 155, 167, 181, 183, 187, 189, 191, 193, 197, 199, 203, 201, 281, 315, 337, 363, 373, 391, 503, 513, 547, 549, 551, 561, 565
sufficiency of Christ's passion or sacrifice 7, 147, 197, 519
supernatural 3, 7, 13, 25, 77, 83, 91, 135, 209, 211, 217, 251, 259, 285, 289, 415, 559, 591, 667
supernaturalis (adj.), see Glossary 24, 76, 82, 90, 134, 208, 210, 216, 250, 258, 284, 288, 558, 590, 667, 672
superstition, superstitious 12, 349, 393, 391, 399, 401, 429, 435, 437, 455, 471, 473, 477, 489, 491, 525, 561
Supper, Lord's, or holy supper 63, 161, 397, 489, 493, 571, 615
supplication 431, 439
suppositum (n.), see Glossary 112, 544, 668, 672
supralapsarian 3, 4, 35, 36, 37, 63
Surendonck, William, or Guilielmus Andreae Surendonck 589
Swavius, Daniel, or Daniel de Swaef 159
Switzerland 93
sword 241, 403, 537
syllogism 8, 10, 251, 255
synecdoche, synecdochical 51, 73, 87, 89, 121, 143, 243, 625
synecdoche (n.), *synecdochice* (adv.), see Glossary 50, 72, 88, 120, 142, 242, 292, 310, 311, 318, 334, 624, 672
Synod of Dort 1, 2, 4, 16, 27, 31, 35, 36, 139, 209, 211, 219, 223, 271, 311, 437, 523, 655, 657
Synod of Orange 57

synods 97, 465, 639
Syria 97
Syriac language 509, 605
Syro-Phoenician woman 603

tabernacle 433, 465
tables of the Law 123, 281, 361, 445, 585, 655
Talmud 525
Tan, Seng-Kong 115
Tanach 531
Tapper, Ruard 519
Tarsus 95
Tavard, George H. 641
tax-collector 303, 425
temperance 263, 333
temple 171, 391, 433, 575, 587, 595, 611, 615, 647
temptation 51, 267, 275, 405, 479, 495
Terence 473
terminus (n.), see Glossary 54, 55, 70, 114, 115, 292, 294, 302, 316, 508, 520, 673
terror 543
Tertullian 93, 95, 147, 151, 155, 301, 391, 469, 531, 533, 547, 557
testament 375, 585, 673
Testament, New 11, 14, 25, 63, 111, 125, 199, 217, 221, 249, 293, 347, 377, 379, 387, 407, 433, 469, 481, 489, 491, 563, 565, 605, 623, 625, 629, 631
  Old 7, 14, 111, 125, 169, 217, 221, 301, 347, 377, 379, 395, 397, 409, 431, 433, 469, 485, 489, 557, 563, 629, 657
  Old and New 67, 107, 121, 197, 413, 429, 439, 527, 565, 571
Testardus, Paulus, or Paul Testard 228
testimonium (n.), see Glossary 66, 106, 110, 140, 216, 218, 222, 252, 254, 256, 258, 358, 360, 460, 474, 476, 500, 502, 504, 518, 536, 538, 552, 560, 608, 626, 636, 638, 673
testimony 67, 107, 111, 223, 253, 255, 257, 259, 325, 349, 361, 439, 461, 475, 477, 483, 501, 503, 504, 505, 519, 537, 538, 539, 552, 553, 561, 609, 627, 637, 639
Theodoret 531
theologians, Lutheran 219, 241, 397, 421, 511
  Reformed or Calvinist 3, 37, 153, 175, 201, 223, 415, 431, 447
  Roman Catholic or papal 9, 15, 113, 123, 125, 127, 169, 259, 291, 325, 327, 349, 503, 585
theology 67, 131, 159, 181, 209, 229, 277, 305, 319, 443, 509, 559, 589, 663, 664, 666, 671, 672
  medieval 10, 141, 245, 261, 331, 345, 447, 533
  Reformed 1, 3, 17, 53, 125, 201, 205, 223, 238, 273, 365, 403, 573, 641, 661
  Roman Catholic 237, 245, 267, 295, 298, 333, 337, 505, 527, 551, 553
theopneustos (adj.) 365
theotokos (n.), of Mary 79
Thomism, Thomist 153, 327, 415
Thornai, Caspar P. 457
Thou, Jacques Auguste de 505
Thouars 131
Thouzellier, Christine 561
Thysius, Antonius 2, 3, 4, 9, 13, 14, 15, 35, 67, 69, 75, 81, 83, 87, 95, 181, 183, 191, 199, 201, 203, 205, 305, 309, 311, 315, 316, 319, 321, 325, 327, 329, 443, 447, 453, 457, 461, 463, 467, 589, 591, 605, 617
Tienhoven 443
Tillet, Louis de 641
Tilley, Maureen A. 369
Timothy 217, 391, 401, 609, 633
tinder for sin 517
Titus 401, 629, 633
Toledo, Francisco de 419, 543
tradition 15, 121, 123, 239, 241, 347, 349, 377, 381, 385, 407, 409, 503, 505, 507, 539, 609, 645
transgression 61, 187, 310, 339, 376, 383, 517
treasure 331, 367, 465, 542, 543
treasury 413, 461, 545, 547, 553, 555
Trelcatius Sr., Lucas 219
Tremellius, Immanuel 605
tribe 75, 179, 417, 645
tribulation 525, 551
Trinity, Trinitarian 2, 17, 67, 69, 71, 79, 93, 101, 103, 105, 107, 111, 113, 115, 117, 207, 255, 309, 415, 661, 663, 664, 668
tritheism 95
trust in God, in Christ 49, 287, 339, 415, 665
Turin 503
Turretin, Franciscus 115

Tusculan 515
Twisse, William 105
type 137, 195, 221, 377, 389, 395, 431, 613
tyrant, tyranny 10, 61, 177, 377, 381, 593, 615, 643, 645, 647

Ubiquitarians 6, 97, 98, 161, 165, 167, 175
underworld 148, 149, 151, 499, 501, 505, 525, 557, 563
universe 100, 418, 566, 663
unrighteousness 211, 326, 367, 369
unwritten traditions 239, 241, 349, 503, 507
Urbicus 481
Ursatius 369
Ursinus, Zacharias 163
Ussher, James 547, 548
Utrecht 443, 499, 589

Valckenaer, Isaac 621
Valentino, Josephus Angles 95, 552
Goarishusanus, Valentius Gerhardi 213
vanity 409, 429, 433
Vázquez, Gabriel 551
Veen, Mirjam G.K. van 159, 570
Velde, Dolf te 1, 10
Venema, Cornelis P. 309
veneration 349, 495
Vergil 525
Vermeij, Rienk 169
Vermigli, Peter Martyr 93, 352, 573
vessel 37, 49, 51, 53, 55, 313
vicar of Christ, of God 123, 125, 127, 609
vice 227, 347, 351, 352, 357, 401, 409, 493, 639
victim 123, 147, 177, 421
Victoria, magister 552
Victorinus 531
victory 127, 151, 155, 163, 275, 381
vigil 443, 467, 471, 479
vine 347, 349
vineyard 225, 563, 610, 621
Vio, Thomas de, or Cajetan 390
virginity 421
virtue 155, 191, 215, 216, 225, 243, 245, 247, 249, 261, 263, 333, 337, 351, 352, 353, 355, 405, 411, 449, 451, 491
vision 531, 533, 562, 563, 565
Vitoria, Francisco de 553
Vlissingen 23, 277
Voetians 101
Voetius, Gisbertus 4, 35, 63, 463, 465, 657
Vogelsang, Erich 147
voice 53, 565, 571, 583, 593, 613, 649
Vollert, Cyril 161
voluntas (n.), see Glossary 34, 38, 44, 46, 48, 52, 58, 62, 70, 80, 102, 106, 144, 146, 162, 172, 176, 182, 184, 192, 212, 214, 224, 232, 236, 242, 244, 246, 272, 282, 284, 286, 288, 290, 316, 318, 334, 398, 426, 446, 448, 458, 540, 662, 673
Vos, Antonie 181
Vossius, Gerardus Joannes 43
Vossius van Borgloon, Gerardus 510
vote 637, 639, 643, 655
vow 9, 11, 12, 289, 331, 349, 361, 413, 451, 455, 483, 485, 487, 489, 491, 493, 495, 497, 499
Vrolikhert, Godewardus 23
Vulgate 63, 442, 477

Waal, De 343
wages 317, 365
Walaeus, Antonius 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 43, 45, 47, 49, 51, 53, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 63, 159, 161, 165, 169, 276, 277, 285, 287, 290, 297, 298, 303, 385, 412, 413, 415, 417, 419, 421, 431, 433, 558, 559, 561, 563, 567, 569, 570, 573, 575, 577, 579, 581, 583, 585, 587
war 375, 381, 437, 445, 567, 587
Waterlanders, anabaptist party 303, 429
weakness 77, 159, 205, 227, 271, 301, 361, 383, 401, 423, 437, 503
wealth 459, 537
wedding banquet 225, 577
wedding garment 577
Westerburgh, Johannes a 443
Westminster Shorter Chatechism 133
wickedness 219, 281, 345
widow 75, 429, 449, 455, 461, 653
Wilhelm, Herzog von Bayern 138, 539
will, divine 5, 29, 31, 35, 37, 39, 49, 53, 59, 61, 63, 71, 81, 103, 107, 147, 173, 183, 193, 201, 205, 213, 233, 247, 317, 333, 339, 399, 415, 427, 449, 459, 611, 667, 669, 673
  human 45, 59, 77, 181, 225, 237, 243, 245, 247, 267, 273, 285, 287, 289, 319, 335, 345, 385, 447, 459, 541
Williams, Frank 421

Williams, George Huntston 177, 303, 387, 397, 562
wisdom 15, 31, 35, 37, 49, 61, 65, 71, 73, 81, 91, 105, 113, 119, 121, 143, 201, 247, 349, 401, 417, 427, 615, 651, 668
Wittenberg 219, 247, 397
Wittius, Hadrianus 219
Wojdowski, Andreas 625
Wollebius, Johannes 115
womb of Mary 77, 79
Worcester 651
Word of God 4, 7, 8, 13, 14, 23, 36, 51, 67, 83, 85, 93, 105, 109, 111, 121, 123, 125, 139, 141, 173, 177, 207, 211, 221, 225, 233, 235, 239, 241, 243, 249, 251, 253, 255, 257, 259, 265, 299, 309, 317, 347, 379, 385, 399, 405, 415, 429, 491, 493, 503, 513, 561, 571, 573, 575, 581, 583, 585, 589, 597, 621, 631, 633, 635, 641, 653, 655
world 1, 7, 27, 31, 37, 39, 41, 47, 53, 71, 79, 99, 127, 145, 165, 167, 173, 175, 177, 183, 185, 197, 203, 207, 209, 211, 223, 225, 279, 281, 295, 321, 351, 369, 409, 415, 417, 419, 445, 501, 503, 509, 513, 557, 569, 571, 573, 575, 577, 583, 585, 587, 595, 609, 613, 615, 621, 627, 629, 631, 655, 663, 664
worship 11, 209, 347, 355, 385, 389, 393, 397, 407, 413, 415, 419, 429, 433, 445, 469, 477, 485, 491, 497, 561, 570, 611, 651
Woudt, 't 305
Wouters, Antonius P.F. 621
wretchedness 187, 207, 377, 453
Württemberg 167
Wyclif, John 573

Yom Kippur 523

Zaandam 499
Zanchi, Jerome 39, 205, 385
Zebedee 171, 607
Zechariah, prophet 643
Zechariah, father of John the Baptist 657
Zeeland 23, 413
Zijlstra, Samme 429
Zion 565, 575
Zoutelande 23
Zürich 93
Zwingli 574